DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 803 HE 030 572

AUTHOR	Gade, Marian L.
TITLE	Four Multicampus Systems: Some Policies and Practices That Work. AGB Special Report.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI.
ISBN	ISBN-0-926508-01-6
PUB DATE	1993-00-00
NOTE	77p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036; phone: 202-296-8400; fax: 202-223-7053 ($9.95 members, 10 or more, $6.95 each; $13.95 nonmembers, 10 or more, $10.95 each).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Centralization; College Administration; College Role; Community Colleges; Educational Policy; *Governance; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; *Multicampus Colleges; *Policy Formation; School Policy; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Kansas Board of Regents; Maricopa County Community College District AZ; University of California; University of North Carolina

ABSTRACT

The report describes the functions of multicampus systems of higher education in the United States, considers their growing importance, identifies common concerns, and presents ideas for addressing those concerns. It is based on interviews conducted during 1991 and 1992 with administrators, faculty, trustees, and other experienced professionals, at four systems: the University of California, the University of North Carolina, Kansas Board of Regents institutions, and the Maricopa County Community College District (Arizona). Sixteen "good ideas" for governance, adaptable to other systems, are discussed: protecting education and research from undue outside pressure; leaving coordination and control of academic affairs in faculty hands; encouraging intercampus cooperation in program development and operation; assigning principal responsibility for certain programmatic or administrative tasks and activities to one lead campus; allocating programs systemwide among campuses; ensuring open communication at all levels; consulting with administrative councils on all campuses; communicating the benefits of higher education support directly to state legislators and citizens; centralizing relations with state and federal governments; preserving campus flexibility when centralizing; centralizing admissions; establishing campus boards of trustees; maximizing local budget control; decentralizing physical plant decisions; raising funds as a campus activity; and continually revitalizing leadership. A table of system data is appended. (MSE)

ED 412 803

AGB SPECIAL REPORT

Four Multicampus Systems: Some Policies and Practices That Work

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

By Marian L. Gade

Made possible by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

HE 031 572

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AGB SPECIAL REPORT

Four Multicampus Systems: Some Policies and Practices That Work

By Marian L. Gade

Made possible by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

About AGB

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) advances the practice of voluntary trusteeship, a distinguishing characteristic of American education for more than 350 years. AGB's membership comprises 1,100 boards that oversee 1,700 campuses in the U.S., Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean, Europe, and Pacific Trust Territories. It includes every type of higher education institution in the public and private sectors, state coordinating boards, specialized schools, boards of public college and university foundations, and independent K-12 schools. More than 30,000 individuals are members of these boards and members of AGB.

©1993 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN # 0-926508-01-6

4

Contents

Foreword v

Introduction vii

Highlights ix

CHAPTER 1
Multicampus Systems and Their Shared Concerns. 1
System Functions and Challenges

CHAPTER 2
Ideas That Work 13
Successful Approaches to Problems Common to Higher Education Systems

CHAPTER 3
Four Multicampus Systems: A Closer Look 23
The University of North Carolina 23
The Kansas Board of Regents Institutions 32
Arizona's Maricopa County Community College District 41
The University of California 48

APPENDICES
Appendix A: Systems Data 63
Appendix B: Bibliographic Note 65
Appendix C: Those Who Have Helped in this Study 67

Foreword

The majority of American students attend public institutions, most of which are a part of multicampus systems. These systems now are being subjected to intense pressures, with expectations for their performance and adaptability far outstripping available resources. As their leaders struggle to respond to these demands while maintaining standards of excellence and access, they do so in largely uncharted territory, with little information to guide them in their search for enlightened policies and practices.

No comprehensive examination of multicampus systems has been conducted since the mid 1970s. In the ensuing two decades, however, we have witnessed radical change in the environment in which these systems must operate. Consequently, this study is an important step in the right direction.

Through interviews with trustees, campus and system executives, and state policy makers, University of California research associate Marian L. Gade has examined four disparate systems—the University of North Carolina, the Kansas Board of Regents institutions, the University of California, and the Maricopa County Community College District in Arizona—in an effort to discover which policies and practices contribute to stability, efficiency, and excellence.

How are systems affected by competition or cooperation among campuses? How do bureaucratic structures influence what is done at the campus level and the system level? How does the culture of the state influence the system's operations? Do centralized systems work better than decentralized ones? These issues, at the heart of Marian Gade's study, matter to AGB and to the trustees and regents that volunteer their time and energy to serve on multicampus system boards. She and the AGB Board of Directors join with me in urging that more study be conducted to strengthen the effectiveness of multicampus and state system structures.

On behalf of AGB, I would like to thank the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, which has supported the work of AGB in many ways over the years. Its generous grant made this study possible. I also would like to acknowledge the participation of the chief executives and other leaders of the four systems who cooperated in this project.

Richard T. Ingram
President, Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Introduction

This report describes the functions of multicampus systems of higher education in the United States, considers their growing importance, identifies their common concerns, and presents good ideas for addressing those concerns. It then provides more detailed information about four successful multicampus systems, a task essential to recognizing which good ideas are adaptable to other systems.

No two multicampus systems are alike. Each has its own history and culture, missions, structures, and constituents, but all can learn from one another.

I am grateful to my advisory panel, which helped identify four multicampus systems that:

- operate under a single governing board (coordinating boards are not discussed, but some ideas here may be helpful to them);
- have existed long enough to prove capable of functioning through profound changes in their states;
- are known in their states and elsewhere for traditions of good governance;
- illustrate the wide range of missions and functions that systems serve; and
- represent different regions in the nation.

The systems included are the following:

- The University of North Carolina, with 16 campuses and more than 150,000 students.
- The Kansas Board of Regents institutions, with six universities enrolling 85,000 students.
- Arizona's Maricopa County Community College District, with ten campuses and centers serving more than 175,000 students in its credit and noncredit programs.
- The University of California, with nine campuses and 165,000 students.

This report is based directly on approximately 80 interviews conducted in 1991 and 1992 with participants in these systems, including their chief executive officers, campus faculty and administrators, and trustees, as well as with other experienced "system watchers." The context also relies heavily on the author's prior interviews for AGB studies of presidents and trustees, including many in multicampus systems. These works include *Presidents Make a Difference* (1984); *The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place & Character* (1986); and *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities* (1989).

I am grateful, too, to the CEOs and other key people in each system for their time, advice, and cooperation. Their answers to the last question in each interview

are the heart of this report: "What works well in your system that might be helpful to folks in other systems?"

Chapter 1 describes the functions of public multicampus systems—which now enroll well over half of America's college and university students—and identifies concerns all systems share. Chapter 2 collects good ideas gathered from the four systems studied, providing a brief context for each idea. The two chapters are designed to be read in an evening by busy trustees and CEOs. Chapter 3 contains fuller discussions of the four systems, essential to recognizing *how* ideas evolved, *why* they work, *what* needs they serve, and *if* they are adaptable to the entirely different history, missions, and structures of your own system. The more detailed information is useful to those trustees, CEOs, and systems staff members studying each idea in greater depth.

I hope the report will stimulate and prove useful to all those interested in and responsible for maintaining high-quality educational programs in this era of growing demands and dwindling resources.

In addition to the advisory panel and those who graciously gave of the rtime and experience through interviews, I would also like to thank the staff of AGB, especially Tom Ingram, who invited me to conduct this study and provided help and encouragement throughout, and the Kellogg Foundation for its financial support of this project.

Most of all, I want to acknowledge, with deep thanks, the support of Clark Kerr, my guide and teacher in the world of higher education for 25 years.

Marian L. Gade
Berkeley, California

Highlights

Trustees and administrators of public multicampus universities carry a great responsibility for the health of America's education enterprise. More than one-half of all college and university students are enrolled on campuses within these systems. Especially in times of financial constraints, trustees must review the structures and practices within their systems to seek improvements in management and governance. Even minor adjustments can result in more effective delivery of educational and public services, as well as more efficient and cost-effective operations.

To help trustees identify successful structures and practices that might be adapted to their own systems, this report examines four different public multicampus systems in the United States with histories of stability and successful operations over a period of years. The following "ideas that work" are derived from interviews with trustees, administrators, and others within the four systems and around the country.

Ideas to consider adapting or adopting:

1. Protect education and research from undue outside pressures. These activities should take place on campuses, not in systems.

2. Leave the coordination and control of academic affairs in faculty hands. The system chief executive's role is to use his or her influence and budgetary powers to initiate and encourage systemwide academic initiatives.

3. Encourage intercampus cooperation in program development and operation.

4. Assign principal responsibility for certain programmatic or administrative tasks and activities to one lead campus, where academic benefits may accrue from the delegation.

5. Pay major, systemwide attention to allocating programs among campuses at the graduate and professional level; program duplication at the undergraduate level is not a major issue.

6. Ensure open communication—formal and informal—based on mutual respect and trust, at all levels of a system. The board must be an integral part of the communications network.

7. Consult with councils of administrators with similar functional responsibilities on the different campuses to determine the potential effect of policies under board consideration, coordinate decision making, and provide feedback to the board and system staff.

8. Communicate directly to state legislators and citizens the benefits that accrue from supporting their higher education system.

9. Centralize relations with the state and federal governments, with the exception of individual grants to researchers.

10. Preserve maximum campus flexibility when centralizing operations to achieve economies of scale.

11. Centralize student admissions procedures, giving campuses discretion in individual cases. This applies only in single-mission systems with similar standards for all campuses.

12. Establish campus boards of trustees under the general oversight of the system board.

13. After budgets are allocated to campuses, maximize local control.

14. Decentralize, as far as possible, decisions about the physical development of a campus.

15. Consider fund-raising from individuals and private organizations as principally a campus, not a system, activity.

16. Provide for continual revitalization of top-quality leadership on the board and in administrative positions.

CHAPTER 1
Multicampus Systems and Their Shared Concerns

In the last 30 years, multicampus systems have become the dominant form of higher education in the United States. Nearly three-fourths of the students now enrolled in public colleges and universities attend schools that are a part of a multicampus system.[1] And yet most of those who write about higher education usually refer to single-campus institutions, each with its own president and board of trustees. Although analyses of systems' policies were common in the 1960s and early 1970s, the last full study was Eugene C. Lee and Frank Bowen's classic, *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance*.[2]

Today's reality is that trustees in some 120 public systems covering some 1,000 campuses—each very different from the others—must make decisions about higher education in consultation with system and campus chief executives, faculty and student representatives, the state government, and interested citizens. Their knowledge of precisely how those decisions will affect any individual campus is, of necessity, limited.

Why Multicampus Systems?

Why have these systems developed so rapidly? State governments established higher education systems to accomplish several purposes:

- Access. Citizens need a choice of educational opportunities, institutions, and programs with minimal geographic and demographic gaps, or access becomes a hollow promise.
- Accountability. A system can assure citizens that resources are well spent by reviewing programs, standards, and outcomes to maintain quality, efficiency, and effectiveness.
- Differentiation. A system can concentrate resources on various campuses to achieve different missions and to serve a diverse clientele.
- Political balance. Systems can reconcile regional and economic imbalances within states. Competition for new institutions or programs and the aspirations of growing communities, for example, can be better negotiated within the system than in the legislative arena.

Systems serve many, often incompatible, purposes. In the 1990s and beyond, it is crucial to coordinate these many needs under severe resource constraints. Systems must balance access, program availability, and choice for students with quality assurance in teaching and research—all with constrained resources.

System functions

Systems, small or large, perform similar core functions. One recent study described "the principal responsibilities of a governing board of a public multicampus system and thus of its chief executive officer and system central administration" as follows:[1]

- Leadership to the system, to public higher education, and to higher education generally, including the establishment of a systemwide mission, the approval of constituent campus missions, and advocacy for the needs of the state and its students and citizens;
- The appointment, compensation, periodic evaluation, occasional removal, and constant support of campus or institutional chief operating officers;
- The allocation of resources among the institutions comprising the system;
- The assessment, approval, initiation, and recission of academic programs and research endeavors;
- Policies and programs to ensure student access to the system as a whole;
- The oversight of board and systemwide policies dealing with the needs, interests, and behavior of students;
- Business administration and stewardship over state resources;
- Information and institutional research;
- Public relations and advocacy;
- Personnel policies, terms and conditions of employment, and (if provided by law) collective bargaining;
- Legal services and legal representation of the board and of staff and faculty acting on behalf of the system;
- Consolidation of administrative and academic support services.

Where there is no single governing board, some functions are performed by each individual board and campus, such as hiring a president, conducting public relations, handling legal matters, and dealing with students. Others are performed by state government, such as direct legislative allocation of resources among institutions. Still others are shared among the institution, state government, and a higher education coordinating mechanism, such as defining policies and programs to ensure access and meet the needs of the state and its citizens. An organized system of higher education helps ensure, although it does not guarantee, that academic integrity predominates in decision making affecting many campuses.

Challenges for trustees

The board of a multicampus system must do two contradictory things in carrying out these functions. First, it must have a systemwide viewpoint, spending its time on the public purposes of the system and on policy issues affecting all campuses. Second, it also must find time to visit and learn about the unique cultures and dimensions of each constituent unit. People on each campus must see it as that campus's governing board.

Good systems work at giving trustees a sense of each campus without compromising campus integrity and without ignoring system priorities. An inventory of how board members' time is used helps to indicate whether that balancing act takes place. A board also can examine whether its questions and actions help campuses focus on their missions or whether they distract from that focus by creating extra work. Trustees need to know when not to respond to issues of faculty employment or student life, for instance, that are better left to the individual campuses.

Types of Systems

Twenty-three states consolidate their four-year colleges and universities (and sometimes two-year institutions) under a single statewide governing board. Others have established system boards to govern selected groups of public institutions, such as a regional grouping or all two-year colleges. This report addresses only the systems with a single governing board for several institutions. However, similar issues arise with coordinating boards or their agencies, so similar solutions may be applicable. Most states without statewide governing boards do have some kind of coordinating mechanism.

Multicampus systems of higher education are different and complicated, and the institutions that comprise them can be classified in a number of ways. The terms used throughout this report (e.g., research university) follow the Carnegie Classification system.[4] It can be argued that it muddies the waters to include all these different organizational structures under the rubric of multicampus systems. Despite the differences, however, these systems also have much in common, and the emphasis in this report is on problems that all must face.

Current Dilemmas in Higher Education

The higher education enterprise today is in deep trouble. Financial woes beset almost every state and are not likely to go away in the near future, if ever. Competition for funds with other public agencies and purposes—health, safety, welfare, elementary and secondary education—is made more intense by difficult economic times. In addition, public confidence in all major institutions has declined, although higher education remains near the top of the list of those in which confidence remains high. And demands upon higher education—for access, for quality, for contributions to economic development—continue to increase as resources become more and more constrained.

There is no magic bullet to solve these problems at the national or state level or at the higher education system level. And it is not clear that what has worked in the past will be suitable for confronting these and other dilemmas. However, even as we deal with the difficulties posed by new economic and political scenarios and consider new ways of organizing our boards and institutions, our education institutions must continue to function. Boards must set policy, administrators allocate programs and resources, faculty teach and do research, and students attend classes and take exams. Even as we consider new structures and processes, it is essential to make those we now have work as well as they possibly can.

Themes from the Interviews

The following common themes emerged early in interviews with system participants:

- Communication and culture. Formal and informal channels of communication as they have developed within the different historical, political, and cultural contexts of each institution.
- Centralization and decentralization. What is done on the campuses and what at the system level.
- Coordination and control. How authority is used as system and campuses relate to one another.
- Cooperation and competition. Relations among the campuses in the system.
- Unnecessary program duplication. How systems allocate and review programs and ensure their consistency with campus missions.

These themes are repeated in the coming pages and in the chapters on the four systems. In each system, the themes reflect the historical and cultural precedents that determine structures and ways of work.

Communication and Culture

A state's historical and cultural traditions affect the powers and responsibilities that systems and campuses are given and how campuses relate to one another.

Political traditions

Political traditions affect how a system is organized and how it functions. For example, a state's commitment to localism or regionalism may dictate that seats on the board of trustees be rotated among congressional districts. Or a state tradition of "pure" democracy or populism may dictate that trustees be elected by the voters rather than selected by the governor or the legislature. For example, North Carolina's government is heavily dominated by the legislature. It is the only state in which the governor has no veto over legislation. Members of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina are elected by the legislature instead of through the more common form of gubernatorial appointment (with or without legislative approval). In Arizona, trustees of the Maricopa County Community College District are elected by direct vote in districts.

Educational history

A system's own history affects its structure. It may be a flagship system growing from a single campus or a "shotgun wedding" between existing institutions.[5] The University of California, for example, considers itself "one university" located on nine diverse campuses, and its faculty is united in a systemwide academic senate. On the other hand, the University of North Carolina and the Kansas systems are collections of previously separate institutions.

Informal channels of communication

Communication flows not just through formal structures. That is, an administrator or faculty member need not go through a campus chief executive to talk to a system officer. A pattern shared by three of the four systems is for authority and responsibility to flow only through the chief executive, from the board to the system head to the campus chief executives who report to him or her. But communication, consultation, and coordination flow also through officers with similar functions at campus and system levels. Academic-affairs people, student-affairs officers, financial managers, and others communicate through meetings, memos, telephone calls, or E-mail, and even social contacts help cement common bonds. The most open communication in the four systems is in Arizona's Maricopa County Community College District. Here the electronic communications and information system is open to everyone, including trustees, who are provided home terminals for access to the network.

Trust

Interviewees stressed trust and openness as being the most important factors for achieving results. Trust cannot be achieved by administrative fiat. Chief executives must trust their subordinates to provide information affecting their work or decision making. In turn, faculty and staff must feel secure that trial balloons, informal conversations, and admissions of error will not be used against them in office or academic politics. Effective governance and management rest upon sharing information, respect, and restraint.

Centralization and Decentralization

How authority and responsibility are divided among the campus, the system, and the state—who does what—is a central concern. What belongs to the campus and what should be done at the system level? In some systems, the state is a much more active player in day-to-day operations. For example, nonacademic employees in both the Kansas and North Carolina systems are under state civil-service and pension plans.

Perceptions of centralization

On the campuses of every system, little distinction is perceived between the system, its board and administration, and the state legislature and executive branches. Anything decided beyond the campus is considered a system decision. Campus chief

executives know differently, but faculty, staff, and students tend to lump together system and state government policies. And in a general way, those within higher education think of the state, too, as monolithic, even though some important decisions are legislative mandates, while others come from state agencies or the governor's office.

In organizations, including colleges and universities, there always seems to be a "we" and "they" perception. "We," the campus faculty and administrators, may wage battle against "them," the system administrators. "We" don't like "them" telling us what to do. "We," the system administrators, know how to run our business better than "they," the state officials, do.

This universal tendency produces tensions built into organizations. What a legislator believes is an appropriate delegation of authority may look quite different to a system administrator and different still to a person on campus. As the saying goes, "Where you stand depends on where you sit." It is not a case of being right or wrong, but of seeing the world from a different perspective.

Divided responsibilities

Some functions are performed at both the campus and system levels. Responsibilities are divided, and reporting arrangements may be unclear. Consider the University of California under President Robert Gordon Sproul (1930–1958). Many administrative tasks were performed on the several campuses, but those who performed them, such as business managers, reported not to a campus head but directly to an officer in the president's office in Berkeley. Budget officers reported to the office of the president, as did grounds and buildings superintendents, personnel officers, and others.[6] In this model, personnel and performance are decentralized, but authority is not.

There are considerable differences among the four systems in the responsibilities of campuses and system. Yet most interviewees seemed generally satisfied with current arrangements, although some campuses expressed interest in more budgetary flexibility and control of capital projects, especially selection of architects and building design.

Coordination and Control

A board of trustees is a "bridge," bringing society's needs and concerns to the university and at the same time interpreting the institution to the public.[7] The real challenge for multicampus boards is how to connect their systems with public issues in a long-term systemic way. Simply reacting to outside pressures, whether responding to them or buffering institutions against them, is not enough. Trustees must help create the public agenda and make a statement about the importance of maintaining world-class universities to meet public needs.

Boards differ in their views of how best to accomplish their task of bridging between the state and the campuses.

Board perceptions

Trustees may see themselves principally as a conduit for policies and decisions made outside the system—by the governor who appointed them, by legislators demanding more accountability and efficient management, or by such special-interest groups as labor unions, ethnic or gender groups, or animal-rights advocates.

Most board members, however, see themselves as overall policy makers, devoted to the health of the system and its individual campuses as well as to the legitimate needs of the state and its citizens. Trustees serve as a buffer, protecting the university from undue intrusion. Systems mandated by a state's constitution appear to have more autonomy than those created by the legislature.

The controller

System personnel generally control functions for which the system, not the campuses, is legally responsible. For example, compliance with laws and regulations regarding affirmative action, environmental health and safety, or collective bargaining will, of necessity, fall under system control. However, system officers have different views from campus officers receiving their memoranda on what activities are "controlling," "coordinating," or "supporting."

The initiator

System personnel also initiate ideas and programs to be carried out by one or more campuses, singly or jointly. For example, chief executives initiated systemwide improvement of undergraduate education, use of educational technology, and program reviews in the four systems.

The coordinator

All systems must coordinate campus programs. Some also coordinate work with a state's elementary and secondary schools and private higher education institutions to meet state government requirements. Every system has consultative arrangements to coordinate policies and management decisions made by the system and campuses. This usually takes the form of regular meetings between system and campus heads. Some systems have developed these councils to a high degree. Councils obtain feedback about policies under development, communicate with campus personnel, and participate in decision making.

The supporter

System offices spend much time supporting campuses. Such activities as compiling reports for state and federal agencies, negotiating contracts, and finding the best price for bulk purchases save each campus time and money. The Maricopa County Community College district office's business cards read "Maricopa Community Colleges District Support Services Center." This carries a strong symbolic message, although system and campus administrators alike admit that there is also some control.

The manner in which the system board and office exercises authority differs from time to time and from issue to issue. While support is an appropriate stance in a new program initiative in line with campus mission, control is important where the system is legally liable. All systems perform all functions, but each also has characteristic modes of operation that fall along a continuum from control to initiation to coordination to support.

Cooperation and Competition

How well campuses relate to one another is a good measure of how a system functions. Healthy competition is the rule in these systems, although systems must guide that competition and coordinate cooperative ventures in administration and programs.

Cooperation

Cooperation among campuses is one of the great benefits of a system, offering great possibilities for as-yet-untapped creativity. System guidelines can promote cooperation between the campuses that might not occur where there is open competition for funding or programs. However, program sharing is not as widely practiced as one might expect. Cooperative programs depend heavily upon individual faculty initiatives and seem as likely to occur between nearby institutions, such as North Carolina State or Chapel Hill with Duke University, as within a system. Efforts move forward as mutual advantages develop.

Lead campus

Another form of institutional cooperation results when one campus, rather than the central office, takes a leading role in providing a service or coordinating a program. These may be services to the state or its citizens, such as when the land-grant campus serves as headquarters for Cooperative Extension and draws upon faculty on other campuses. Or services may be provided to the system itself, as in Kansas, where the university press is run by one campus for the whole system.

Competition

Competition for students, programs, and funds takes place within system structures that minimize end-runs to the state and encourage an "all-for-one and one-for-all" attitude. A system that rewards working out differences before they get to the state level and punishes politicking on behalf of one campus at the expense of another helps ensure reasonable allocation of resources and reassures the state that its higher education system is working.

Unnecessary Duplication

Allocating missions and programs to institutions is a major function of systems, and there is widespread concern about unnecessary duplication of courses or programs among institutions. This concern is mostly unwarranted at the undergraduate level, except for some costly specialized programs.

Limitations at the graduate and professional levels, however—both financial and in terms of expert faculty, qualified students, and job markets for graduates—lend greater weight to states' desires to ensure that unbridled regional and institutional competition does not lead to overbuilding of programs. System oversight of program establishment and review has become a principal means of ensuring accountability to the state with respect to what is necessary or unnecessary program duplication on the several campuses of the system.

Economic concerns

As economic times become harder and higher education resources are squeezed, states scrutinize colleges and universities even more closely to ensure that money is well spent and programs are justified. Taxpayers want to know they are receiving good value for their educational investment: They see businesses cutting employees and expenses—doing more with less—and ask their schools what they are doing to provide the best educational quality at the least possible cost. However, experience suggests that program reviews may improve quality more than they reduce costs, at least in the short run:

> Although there is still debate over whether program evaluation, and particularly program review, actually saves the State or institutions money through improved programmatic offerings, coordination, or program discontinuance, there is little doubt that such evaluation is an effective tool in program improvement as well as in long-range planning and budgeting efforts, especially if it brings together in one vehicle the consideration of academic, fiscal, personnel, organization, and facilities issues.[8]

Academic drift

Colleges tend to become universities. Universities offering masters degrees tend to mount doctoral programs, and those with doctoral programs extend them into new fields. There is a fear that this "drift" leads to programs for which there are not adequate resources and/or markets for graduates. One explanation for academic drift is that most faculty received advanced degrees from research universities, and they want to emulate their former mentors in those institutions. A major reason, however, is heightened aspirations and competition between communities and regions. Citizens seek institutions that will provide broad program choices, promote economic prosperity, and bring prestige to their communities. For example, urban areas want to develop their institutions into research universities, with consequent threats to more rural land-grant institutions. Systems must confront these issues directly, develop strategies to maintain clarity of mission, and guide the political negotiations that make the system work.

Historical causes of duplication

Systems that were at one time segregated by race or gender tend to have more duplicate programs as a result of their history. State systems under court orders to integrate institutions debate, for example, whether moving a popular program from

a traditionally white campus to a traditionally black campus (or vice versa) as a means of ending duplicative programs will increase the "minority" student body on the receiving campus. Mixed results suggest "probably not." But such systems will continue to be pressured to eliminate duplicate programs to ensure racial integration in similar programs elsewhere.

At the same time, the supportive environments and higher graduation rates for minority students found in traditionally minority institutions, as well as political support for them from leading alumni, mitigate against closing programs on these campuses. Some observers note with irony that the states that, under legal segregation, provided the greatest educational opportunities for black students in the form of separate institutions now must make the thorniest decisions regarding duplicative programs.

Program duplication is a central concern for some systems. The assignment of missions and programs goes to the heart of what institutions do—whom they enroll, what they teach—and is used as a touchstone to illustrate different approaches to adjusting to changing societal demands and expectations. Two of the systems considered here, North Carolina and Kansas, recently have undertaken systemwide academic program reviews, and their experiences are outlined in detail in Chapter 3.

Endnotes:

1. Kerr, Clark and Marian L. Gade. *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1989, p.115.

2. Lee, Eugene C. and Frank Bowen. *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. It is dismaying to see how many of the problems and concerns Lee and Bowen identified have changed very little in the more than 20 years since their book was published. However, central system boards and administrators tend to play a larger role in several key areas today. They are more involved in questions of mission and academic programs, in dealing with assessment and accountability, and in buffering campuses against an increasing burden of governmental regulation and legal challenges.

3. Johnstone, D. Bruce. *Central Administrations of Public Multi-Campus College and University Systems: Core Functions and Cost Pressures, with Reference to the Central Administration of the State University of New York.* Studies in Public Higher Education, No. 1. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1992, pp. 4-5.

4. The categories are Research Universities I and II; Doctorate-Granting Colleges and Universities I and II; Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I and II; Liberal Arts Colleges I and II; Two-Year Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges; Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions; and Corporate-Sponsored Institutions. See *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (1987 Edition). Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

5. Lee and Bowen, 1971, p. 69, speaking of the consolidation of Chapel Hill, NC State, and Greensboro into the University of North Carolina in 1931.

6. For an excellent description of the development of the UC system organization in this period, see Eugene C. Lee, "The Origins of the Chancellorship: The Public Service Administration Report of 1948," in *Chapters in University of California History,* Berkeley, Calif: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California (forthcoming).

7. See James A. Perkins, "Conflicting Responsibilities of Governing Boards," in James A. Perkins, ed., *The University as an Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pp. 203-214.

8. California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Academic Program Evaluation in California, 1989–90.* Sacramento, Calif.: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1991, p.3.

CHAPTER 2
Ideas That Work

This chapter highlights the ways four successful multicampus systems approach problems common to higher education. Some ideas are generally applicable; others are so context-specific that they may not be workable in a different system. You will need to determine which ideas are relevant to your situation.

1. Education and research take place on campuses, not in systems. Boards and system administrators should protect these activities from undue outside pressures.

Faculty and students are the heart of the enterprise, and their selection, development, and evaluation requires the utmost in campus academic freedom and autonomy. These activities are part of the "private life" of higher education, and decentralization helps to preserve their creativity and spontaneity.[1]

While broad guidance with respect to educational missions, programs, and standards are system matters, campus units, not system offices, should hire individual faculty, teach students, and conduct research. Some exceptions occur, such as agricultural-extension agents or distance-learning units serving all campuses from a lead campus or other central location.

Central coordination is helpful in articulating academic programs between community colleges and four-year institutions. For example, the University of California, through its academic senate, has standardized some general education requirements across campuses to ease transfers from community colleges and between UC campuses. Board members and system personnel in other states hesitate to centralize student requirements, believing it an academic matter best left to campus faculty. Systemwide encouragement for faculty agreement on a "satisfactory general education experience" helps facilitate transfer and build bridges between campuses.

2. Coordination and control of academic affairs should rest largely in faculty hands. System chief executives, however, can use their influence and budgetary powers to encourage systemwide academic initiatives.

Structures for faculty participation in decision making beyond the campus level follow no set pattern. In the University of California, for example, the faculty is an integral part of the university's system of shared governance. The regents delegate to the universitywide academic senate authority to approve and supervise all courses and curricula. In addition, administrators consult with senate representatives on related academic policies, including the budget, academic personnel, and approval and review of graduate programs and research units. In Kansas, the Council of Chief

Academic Officers (COCAO) also institutionalizes some academic input into decision making.

It is important that academics participate not only in decisions about individual courses, but also in shaping the academic program throughout the system, within assigned campus missions. When state budgets are cut in mid-year and administrators are hard-pressed to make ends meet, there is a temptation to short-cut the often drawn-out faculty consultation processes in favor of administrative, or even legislative, decision making. But the consensus is that "It takes less time to touch bases than to mend fences."[2]

Faculty are the heart of the educational enterprise and there need to be regular and formal processes for affirming their curricular authority and responsibility.

At the same time, system chief executives and chief academic officers can use their prestige, influence, and budgetary discretion to exercise academic leadership. Two examples are recent presidential initiatives to upgrade undergraduate teaching in the University of California and the Ocotillo process at Maricopa in the field of educational technology. These were designed to foster educational improvement on campuses, and in each of these cases, discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, central administration sponsored a systemwide conference for faculty, administrators, and others to focus attention and to bring people together to work on a common problem. Central administrations can furnish minimal yet critical support for faculty-built coalitions.

3. Encourage intercampus cooperation in program development and operation.

In addition to providing leadership for joint efforts on systemwide academic issues, systems have a major role to play in assisting cooperative program development. The graduate centers in the University of North Carolina, for example, allow one institution to offer programs on another campus when needed. Increasingly, technologies such as interactive video networks make possible electronic classrooms that extend across campuses or even to noncampus sites. As another example of programmatic cooperation, established campuses can support new programs on other campuses, lending faculty and expertise. The Regents Center, located in the metropolitan Kansas City area, provides a site where several of the Kansas institutions offer programs tailored to the needs of corporate employees in the region. With everyone under pressure to do more with less, cooperative ventures offer opportunities to enhance quality while conserving resources.

4. Assign principal responsibility for a programmatic or administrative task to one of the constituent campuses as lead campus for that activity, where academic benefits may accrue from the delegation.

The concept of a lead campus does not imply that one campus in the system is "the leading campus." Ideally, each campus in the system takes the lead in coordinating systemwide efforts in one or more delegated tasks.

In the most common form of the lead campus, one institution performs a public service for the state, often using faculty and researchers from other campuses. Agricultural extension or water-resource research, for example, can be concentrated on a land-grant campus, yet draw upon experts from other campuses. Distance learning can operate from one campus, yet coordinate faculty throughout the system as instructors. A campus specializing in communications might run the public radio or television station. These models use the expertise and research capacity on all campuses at least cost to the center or the campus, and they also integrate services and academic programs to provide more opportunities for student and faculty research projects and student employment.

A second type of lead campus is one where the system serves its own needs, rather than the state's or the public's needs, by delegating a function to one campus. For example, the University of Kansas runs its system's university press. The system does not have the expense of duplicating the required academic leadership, staffing, or facilities. Or a system might delegate to a campus specializing in technological education and computer science the task of developing a systemwide (or even statewide) student database, easing transfers among campuses and providing transcripts in cases where students take courses on several campuses. Where a function grows logically out of a singular mission or a unique campus resource, the lead campus concept needs to be explored.

5. Pay major systemwide attention to programs at the graduate and professional level; nonspecialized program duplication at the undergraduate level is not a major issue.

Each general campus must have a broad array of programs to serve the students in its assigned geographical region. The costs of nonprofessional undergraduate programs do not differ sufficiently to make it cost-effective to eliminate program duplication at that level across campuses. Money can be saved by eliminating especially costly programs offered on several campuses, and these are usually at the graduate and professional levels. However, potential savings always must be carefully balanced against the potential loss of student access to programs.

Recent extensive studies of programs in Kansas and North Carolina, described in the next chapter, identified less "academic drift" than predicted by the tendency of institutions to want to offer more and higher level programs. Both systems found that campus leaders are responsive to fiscal realities and that clear delineations of institutional missions had, in fact, guided planning.

Monitoring new and old programs is a more important system function now than it was two decades ago because of demands for efficiency and accountability. Only systems can guide new program development to meet state needs, serve all students, and use resources effectively. The following practices help ensure access, efficiency, high-quality research and instruction, and a sense of fairness in a system's programmatic decisions:

- Regular reviews (and adjustment, if necessary) of institutional missions.
- Assurance that programs support the campus's mission.
- Inclusion of outside experts on program mission and review panels.
- Participation of campus faculty and administrators in planning.
- Lump-sum budgeting to campuses, with new programs to be financed within a stable budget or with campus-raised funds.

6. Open communication—formal and informal—based on mutual respect and trust, is essential at all levels of a system of higher education. The board must be an integral part of this communications network.

Organizations everywhere, including colleges and universities, invite trouble by neglecting internal communications. Participants in all four systems believed that openness—the ability to communicate formally and informally across campus-system boundaries and among the campuses—was one of their major strengths, contributing to common purposes and high-quality educational decisions. Trust, respect, openness, and civility in discourse cannot be legislated or commanded, but practices fostering good formal and informal communication include the following:

- Formal consultation processes to engage all participants at an early stage of policy formation. There should be no unwelcome surprises for anyone.
- Frequent informal communication between campus and system offices as well as across system units and among personnel on different campuses.
- Wide dissemination of basic information and notification of upcoming policy decisions, including by electronic means.
- Trustee participation in special campus events.
- Informal social gatherings where faculty, students, administrators, and trustees have opportunities to interact.

7. Use councils of administrators with similar functional responsibilities on the different campuses to study the potential effect of policies under board consideration and to consult, coordinate decision making, and provide feedback to the board and system staff.

Formal meetings between administrators with similar duties in the system and on the campuses encourage early consultation, joint action, peer review and advice, and information sharing. Most systems have occasional informal gatherings of such personnel, often brought together by the appropriate vice president or vice chancellor from the central office. The effectiveness of such gatherings increases, however, where there are regular formal meetings with an agenda and minutes and where substantive matters are addressed.

System heads regularly consult campus chief executives as a group. The most effective systems extend this kind of consultation throughout the organization. Academic-affairs, student-affairs, business, personnel, and other functional officers come together regularly. The result is a functional matrix, superimposed on the hierarchical reporting lines that go through the campus chief executives. People know that their advice, consultation, and assistance will be heard and considered in

policy development. Kansas's councils and California's universitywide advisory groups illustrate this type of governance.

Maricopa County Community College District's executive councils are unique. Each is organized around a topic or function and is composed of persons with similar responsibilities on different campuses as well as representatives of several district constituencies, including trustees. They make decisions for ratification by the board (for example, capital expenditures recommendations), provide a forum where interested people share information and thus make their judgments based on the same facts, and allow informal consultation and negotiation before formal action is taken.

These councils, and how they operate within their system's stucture, are considered at greater length in the next chapter. By studying them, you can determine which kinds of councils will work best in your system.

8. Communicate directly with legislators and the state's citizens to highlight benefits that accrue from public support of the higher education system.

Citizens pay a substantial part of the cost of higher education. They want and deserve to know what their universities and colleges are doing and what benefits they are receiving from their taxes. Support for higher education is embedded in the political and social heritage of a state, but it also can be developed and cultivated by faculty, administrators, and especially by trustees. For example, long-time University of North Carolina President William Friday's tireless efforts to bring the benefits of the university into every one of the state's 100 counties have paid big dividends in support over the years. The consolidated University of North Carolina benefits from the historical prestige of Chapel Hill, but it also has built its own constituency in a state with relatively low educational levels and very limited resources.

9. Relations with the state and federal governments should be handled at the system level, not by individual campuses, with the exception of individual grants to researchers.

A successful centralized system and its board presents a united front when negotiating budgets and programs with the state governor and legislature. A centralized system also can use a combination of threats, rewards, and peer pressure to preclude end-runs by campuses around the system to the state government. Lobbying efforts can take advantage of local contacts between trustees, campus personnel, and legislators, while being structured to ensure that advocacy for the system as a whole is essential if an individual campus is to achieve its goals.

Accountability also is essential. The state holds the central administration, not the campuses, responsible for financial accountability and for compliance with federal and state laws and regulations. System offices need to ensure consistency of policy across campuses, monitor results, and provide legal advice and assistance, while at the same time maintaining campus flexibility in dealing with individual situations.

10. Where economies of scale are crucial, centralize operations while preserving maximum campus flexibility.

Economies of scale are more often associated with nonacademic than with academic functions. Consolidating purchasing pools, debt management, and investing retirement funds, for example, bring financial advantages in the marketplace. A complete student database, in principle, would ease transfers among the system's institutions. Central coordination of information technology saves resources, as in Maricopa's successful experience.

The trick is to find areas where savings accrue *and*, at the same time, services improve. When centralized operations increase campus workloads (e.g., where purchases in small dollar amounts must be centrally approved) or where they preclude campus decisions on individual cases (e.g., in nonacademic hiring decisions), they should be delegated to the campuses.

11. Where a common mission among all institutions creates similar standards for students and faculty, centralize student admissions procedures while allowing campuses to decide individual cases.

The University of California now permits applicants to apply to several campuses with one application form. This reduces applicants' paperwork and enables papers to be easily forwarded to a student's second choice of campus if the first choice is filled. As always, prospective students still must receive early and clear information that enables them to differentiate among the institutions by size, location, cost, mission and programs, prerequisites, campus culture, and other elements that profoundly will affect their college experiences.

In some systems, centralized procedures can be applied to faculty recruitment as well. The Maricopa Community College District has centralized faculty hiring pools, aggregated by field, from which constituent colleges can draw potential faculty. The system is able to advertise widely and draw applicants for a large number of positions at a cost similar to that which a single campus would incur and also can ensure compliance with equal-employment and affirmative-action guidelines. Like centralized student-admissions procedures, such hiring pools work best where campuses have similar missions and education and experience requirements.

12. Establish campus boards of trustees under the general oversight of the system board.

The University of North Carolina's local boards are distinctive. They institutionalize local contacts and support, assist in campus fund-raising, and their members give advice as knowledgeable people familiar with campus programs. These boards are of great help in selecting campus chief executives and advising on campus policies. The next chapter's discussion of their duties and authority should allow you to consider whether this idea is applicable to your system or campus.

Four other four-year systems have such campus boards, although with more limited authority and responsibilities than North Carolina's.[1] In addition, many campuses in other systems have created the functional equivalent of a local board: Presidents rely upon foundation boards, a community advisory group, or even a "kitchen cabinet" for local relations and support, advice, and as a sounding board for

new policies. It is usually better to have these boards officially recognized and accountable.[4]

13. Once budgets are allocated to campuses, maximize local control.

Centralized control of campus expenditures often is a function of state laws, not system practices. To the extent that the system can effect flexibility at the campus level, consistent with accountability for expenditures, it should do so. Lump-sum budgeting to campuses is especially appropriate in these difficult financial times, when imaginative and sometimes uniquely campus-based solutions to hard choices are essential. Establishing general guidelines and post-audit procedures, of course, are still the central administration's task.

From the system head to campus chief executives and on to deans of the schools and colleges on each campus, administrators need some spending flexibility—even more so in bad times than in good. Rigidity can result where all funds are "captured" by existing departments. Even quite small discretionary funds provide good leverage for innovation. The system chief executive might retain small amounts to fund intercampus conferences on issues not fully addressed by any single campus. Or the campus head might retain a small fund for developing campus initiatives that cut across college or departmental boundaries. The dean of a college or school may need to shift funds to protect small but essential programs from being overwhelmed by highly popular ones. This flexibility is more difficult but more essential in times of financial stringency than in periods of easy funding and less critical choices.

14. Decentralize, as far as possible, decisions about the physical development of a campus.

Campuses must live with the results of physical planning, so they must select architects, make building design decisions (within system materials and space-utlitization guidelines), and plan building locations. This improves chances for buildings that complement the landscape, embody elements symbolic to a particular campus's mission or constituents, and exhibit other special features. The University of North Carolina's local boards of trustees play a valuable role in maintaining accountability for capital projects while ensuring local decision making.

15. Fund-raising is principally a campus activity.

System personnel and trustees can help identify and cultivate donors and, of course, contribute their own time and money. They play a substantial role in raising public and private funds. However, principal responsibility for private fund-raising lies with the campuses. Alumni, business donors, and foundations usually have specific campuses, programs, or buildings in mind when they donate, and the request needs to be made by those most familiar with the campus and its needs.

Some projects, especially those that require consortia of public and private campuses and/or systems benefit from systemwide coordination of fund-raising efforts. For example, a major telescope or a nuclear accelerator combines public and private money as well as funds and personnel from a number of institutions. System approval or coordination is appropriate here. Consideration should be given to

delegating major responsibility to a campus or campuses where faculty are participating in the project and where the academic thrust is in line with the campus's mission. Although there may be no monetary advantage, placing responsibility in the appropriate academic unit emphasizes that the institution is in the business of teaching and learning.

Many systems already have faced fund-raising competition between public institutions and nearby private colleges and universities. But a potential problem of competition also exists among campuses within a system for contributions from a particular donor. For example, do alums "belong" to the campus from which they graduated, or are they fair game for any campus in whose jurisdiction they now live or work? As private fund-raising becomes more important for public institutions, fund-raising policies (but not campaigns) may become a more important item on system agendas.

16. Ensure a process of continual revitalization of top-quality leadership on the board and in administrative positions.

A good system ensures good campus leadership. A system head needs to know enough about campus dynamics, politics, and operations to support the campus leader. The system chief executive also must supply leadership so that the campus head is not at sea. One observer refers to the system chief executive as "an anchor to windward" for a strong president who wants to make changes. In a system with many campuses and centers, the governing board has a heavy responsibility to ensure good administrative leadership for the system and its campuses and also to examine its own practices. In each of the systems studied, boards were singled out by faculty and administrators as particularly devoted to the welfare of the system and its institutions. Rules for excellent systemwide trusteeship followed in these systems include the following:

- Don't play favorites among the campuses in the system.
- Don't let partisan political concerns or allegiance to outside interests influence decisions.
- Interpret and support higher education, and the system in particular, to state policy makers and voters.
- Avoid micromanagement, but be aware of how policies will affect individual campuses.
- Be available to give advice when asked.
- Recruit and retain excellent presidents and chancellors. Finding and supporting a good chief executive is a major board responsibility. Top-flight administrators welcome the authority and responsibility to run their own shops and expect to be held accountable for results.

The next chapter examines the four multicampus systems in greater detail. Again, few of these ideas are directly applicable to other systems; most need considered adaptation. With the next chapter's fuller context for each idea and discussion of the outcomes of those ideas, you can see more clearly which ideas will work for you.

Even minor adjustments might result in more quality and efficiency, better cost-effectiveness, and better morale among your system and campus colleagues and perhaps even your citizens and legislators.

Endnotes:

1. Trow, Martin. "The Public and Private Lives of Higher Education," *Daedalus*, 104, 1, Winter 1975, p. 113.

2. Ness, Frederick W. *An Uncertain Glory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971, p. 14.

3. Massachusetts, New York (State University of New York only), Utah, and Maryland (at the discretion of the campus president).

4. For the advantages and possible structures of such boards, see the discussion in Kerr and Gade, *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities, pp.* 123-126.

CHAPTER 3
Profiles of the Four Systems

Let's review the four systems surveyed, going from East to West:

■ The University of North Carolina is a statewide system of 16 institutions that includes all public four-year (including graduate level) colleges and universities in the state. It grew from combining several types of institutions and now enrolls more than 150,000 students.

■ The Kansas Board of Regents system comprises all but one of the state's public four-year undergraduate and graduate institutions, but with a systemwide administrative structure that is markedly different from North Carolina's. The six universities enroll more than 85,000 students. Like North Carolina's system, it combines several formerly separate institutions.

■ The Maricopa County (Arizona) Community College District is made up of ten two-year colleges and centers, enrolling more than 90,000 students in credit courses and serving some 175,000 students each year. It grew from a single institution.

■ The University of California is a nine-campus system of research universities offering undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. One of three segments of public higher education in California, the university enrolls about 165,000 students. Like the Maricopa system, it grew from a single campus.

None of the systems has collective bargaining for faculty. Unionization brings a different set of problems to the central administration, which usually negotiates collective bargaining agreements.

The University of North Carolina

The University of North Carolina was established in 1776 in the state constitution: "[A]ll useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities."[1] Chapel Hill's campus, opened for instruction in 1795, was the nation's first public university and has played a major role in the state's history.

History and Culture

The influence of a state's history on a university system is especially evident in North Carolina. Although no one starting from scratch would design the system as it exists today, its 16 institutions are affected in different ways by these factors:

■ It has both a flagship institution, the pride of its state for 200 years, and a preeminent land-grant agricultural and engineering institution.

■ Its commitment to educating minorities, dating to Reconstruction, led to dual sets of institutions for blacks and whites and another institution for Native Americans.

■ It has several regional universities with strong local support, including a former two-year institution and teacher's college.

■ A small western section of the state, with no major population center, is separated from the rest of the 500-mile-wide state by the East's highest mountain range.

■ In a legislatively dominated state with a Jeffersonian cast of mind, everything is grist for the political mill.

■ University people and public officials know one another across the state and rely heavily on informal communications.

■ It has relatively stable leadership, with only 14 university presidents in 200 years.

Under pressures from federal offices and courts, North Carolina has struggled to allow formerly minority-based institutions to retain both their distinctiveness and their appeal to a wide range of students from all races—arguably contradictory goals. Yet by 1990, 8.3 percent of students on formerly white campuses were black, and 18.2 percent of students on formerly black campuses were white—almost double the figures for the previous decade.

Some people now say that there are too many institutions for the state's 6.8 million people, yet in the 1960s discussions centered on organizing to accommodate an expected tidal wave of students, meet the state's changing needs for economic growth, and extend access to education throughout the state.[2] In 1971, after much study and heated debate, a new University of North Carolina was created that combined the Consolidated University (Chapel Hill, North Carolina State University, and the Woman's College, now UNC-Greensboro), and other state-supported four-year institutions.

A marked feature of the new system was a strong, 32-member board of governors elected by the state legislature. Twelve seats are set aside: four each for women, racial minorities, and the minority political party. The board received wide powers in planning, governance, allocation of functions among the institutions, establishment of new universities, and budgeting. The state itself retained some controls. Local 13-member boards of trustees were established for each campus. These have few statutory powers, but the board of governors can delegate further duties to them.

The university enrolls more than 150,000 students on campuses ranging in size from 700 students (including some high school students) at the School of the Arts to more than 25,000 each at UNC-Chapel Hill and North Carolina State. The system includes research universities, comprehensive universities, a liberal arts college, and a specialized school. North Carolina State University functions as the state's land-grant institution and supervises the network of county agents in the state's 100 counties.

The system is also responsible for the state's public-television network and for a specialized high school for talented math and science students, along with other responsibilities.

The board of governors is legally responsible, too, for preparing a "long-range plan for a coordinated system of higher education" in cooperation with the state board of education, the department of community colleges, and the independent colleges and universities of the state.[3] In practice, this overall coordinating function seldom is exercised.

The statewide sense of history and pride in the university, awareness of the highly charged political atmosphere of the state, reliance on civility and informal communication among those on the higher education scene, and a strong sense of trust in the character and integrity of the system's leadership over a long period of time characterize the University of North Carolina.

Centralization/Decentralization

The University of North Carolina is considered a highly centralized system, yet its central office staff (general administration, known as GA) numbers only about 100 people. Much of what is perceived as controlled by the system is, in fact, the provenance of state government. For example, nonacademic staff are part of the state civil-service system, and retirement is through the state's retirement system of teachers and state employees. One chancellor spoke of a "running battle" between campuses and the state bureaucracy on personnel issues, pointing out that there is much more encroachment by the state than by the system administration on campus personnel power. In addition, purchasing and many financial services are state controlled. Only recently were campuses given, through legislation pushed by Chapel Hill but supported by the other institutions and GA, more budgetary flexibility and some opportunity to retain salary savings, providing incentives for efficient operations.

Relations with the state, especially on budgetary matters, are highly centralized through the board of governors. Money and programs are the two main levers by which the board controls the system, and a unified budget helps ensure that lobbying in the state capital by campus advocates will be for the whole system, not specific institutions.

To raise and handle donated funds, campuses have their own development programs, and some have separate foundations that help provide a special institutional identity. Faculty policies are developed at the campus level, and although the GA sometimes finds it difficult to deal with 16 different faculty codes, it is considered better for each institution to cultivate its own distinctive culture. Each institution controls its physical plant, selecting local architects and contractors so that campuses can retain a special character in keeping with their community, constituents, and traditions.

Campus Boards of Trustees

The most interesting feature of the North Carolina governance system is the decentralization of some functions to campus-based boards of trustees, a structure shared by very few systems around the country.[4] Each 13-member trustee board is made up of eight members elected by the system board of governors, four appointed by the governor, and the president of the student government serving *ex officio*. No one may serve simultaneously on the board of governors and on a board of trustees.

The powers of trustees granted in law are few:

> Each board of trustees shall promote the sound development of its institution within the functions prescribed for it, helping it to serve the people of the State in a way that will complement the activities of the other institutions and aiding it to perform at a high level of excellence in every area of endeavor. Each Board of Trustees shall serve as advjser to the Board of Governors on matters pertaining to its institution and shall also serve as advisor to the Chancellor concerning the management and development of the institution.[5]

The code further states that, "To promote and protect the academic freedom of its faculty, the Board of Trustees of each constituent institution shall adopt policies and regulations governing academic tenure."[6] The trustees play a key role in selecting campus leadership. Chancellors for each campus are named by the board of governors, on the nomination of the system president. The president, in turn, must select from a list of at least two persons recommended by the institutional board of trustees. This provision allows considerable local input into the decision. At the same time, the possibility of an impasse between local preferences and the president's views of what the institution needs is avoided as the code does not specify that the president must choose from the first list submitted; the president can ask for further nominations, and has done so from time to time.

Other duties delegated to the boards of trustees by the board of governors include the following:[7]

- Consultation with the chancellor about faculty promotions to tenure and appointment of senior administrators (recommendations are forwarded to the president for approval by the board of governors).
- Developing personnel policies for those not otherwise covered by state law, the university code, or the policies of the board of governors.
- Ensuring academic program compliance with the assigned missions and role of the institution.
- Authorizing the awards of degrees to individual students.
- Approving honorary degree recipients.
- Advising the chancellor about budget estimates and administration.
- Approving building sites, plans and specifications, selection of architects and engineers, and acceptance of completed buildings and projects.
- Maintaining trust funds.

- Establishing admissions policies and resolving individual admissions questions, within the context of general policies.
- Establishing regulations for collecting tuition, fees, and deposits from students.
- Prescribing regulations for administering institution-specific student financial aid.
- Determining, upon recommendations from the chancellor, what student services will be available.

One function of the trustee boards is to create a bridge between the campus and the local community, but the North Carolina boards fulfill this purpose to varying degrees. For example, as of June 1992, the UNC-Chapel Hill trustee board had no members who lived in Chapel Hill, and three were from outside the state. All the other boards of trustees include both local and statewide representation, along with several out-of-state members. Most chancellors believe they have considerable influence on who is appointed to their trustee boards by the board of governors but little control over the governor's selections.

Campus heads agree that trustees must be involved in real issues; these are the best and brightest citizens in the state and will not long put up with busywork. Trustees' roles are largely based on the personal style of the campus chancellor. Chancellors report using trustees as invaluable sounding boards, sources of advice, counsel, and support, alternative sources of empowerment, and a place for airing grievances.

Many trustees see presenting their campus's needs to the the board of governors and legislature as their most important contribution. Furthermore, those who are local leading citizens generate community support for the campus. Trustees can help in dealing with policies for athletics and other student matters. Their leadership for capital projects helps maintain the distinctiveness and coherence of campus buildings and grounds. Several chancellors made use of their trustees in the recent process of mission review. Boards of trustees help in fund-raising; one chancellor spoke of the board providing respect, integrity, and legitimacy to the campus's fund-raising campaign.

Several interviewees thought the board of governors should delegate further responsibility to the trustee boards, possibly allowing them to make final decisions about some academic promotions now essentially rubber-stamped by the board of governors upon recommendations by the trustees and chancellors.

Is a campus board within a system a help or a hindrance? Surveys show that administrators who have not worked with a local board are thankful they do not have to, while those with a local board don't know how they ever got along without one! The consensus is that these boards take a lot of work on the part of the campus administration—to inform them, involve them, and ensure that they are not just "dealing with piddly things," as one trustee put it. At the same time, they are strong advocates for the campuses, especially in the chancellor-selection process. They help keep the board of governors informed about what is happening on the different

campuses, while at the same time ensuring local accountability so that the governors do not get involved in campus details. They provide a critical link in the communication network between the campus, the board of governors, and the state. They are an invaluable source of political support for their campuses and for the system. The unanimous view of those interviewed was that campus-based boards of trustees are more than worth the trouble.

Coordination and Control

As usual, people on campuses perceive more central control than do central administrators, who see themselves as supportive and facilitating. At UNC, the gap between campus and GA perceptions is not, however, very large. The philosophy of the system's two presidents to date strongly favors campus autonomy. Conversely, campus people believe they will receive GA assistance, but they first try to solve their own problems. And chancellors believe they have the authority and responsibility to run their own campuses.

Faculty leaders from the campuses meet formally on a regular basis in a faculty assembly to give advice on policy to the president and his staff, but they are careful not to undermine the chancellors' authority. Systemwide committees with faculty drawn from several campuses are rare; a recent committee dealing with technology had such representation, but more for the expertise represented by the faculty involved than for a distinct faculty voice.

Administrative councils

Chancellors meet regularly with the president. Chief academic officers from campuses meet with the vice president for academic affairs several times a year. Librarians, graduate deans, registrars, student support staff, and other professionals across the campuses meet from time to time under the system umbrella. Most people see these meetings as a positive aspect of participation in the system, an opportunity to learn from one another and establish good contacts. Some at the two major research universities view these meetings as "a hoop to jump through."

A major purpose of these systemwide meetings is to eliminate the paranoia that comes from not knowing what is going on: "The way you allay fear inside the system is through the flow of information." Policy and fiscal recommendations are often brought to the chancellors before being presented to the board of governors by the president.

Homogeneity or diversity?

Does the system produce homogeneity and conformity among the campuses? Some, especially at Chapel Hill, say there is a tendency toward levelling. They argue that allocating resources to build up regional campuses inevitably reduces what is available for the flagship institutions. Others, including members of the board of governors, point to the increased prestige and higher rankings attained by Chapel Hill and North Carolina State in recent years. They argue that they became world-

class research institutions within the system and that the board and GA protect their special salary and work load provisions.

Cooperation and Competition

Competition among the UNC campuses certainly exists, but the principal competition comes from outside the system. UNC-Chapel Hill and North Carolina State compete with other research universities around the country and have both close cooperative ties as well as competition with neighboring Duke University, a private institution. The North Carolina School of the Arts sees itself as competing with the Juilliard School of Music and the University of Southern California for talented performing artists—not with other institutions in the system. And UNC-Asheville takes as its peer institutions the other "Public Ivies," as well as the two other UNC campuses that serve the western part of the state.

UNC-Charlotte is viewed as a strong competitor by several other campuses. Some at Chapel Hill believe Charlotte aims to become a research university. UNC-Greensboro, a doctoral-granting institution ambitious to move into the ranks of research universities, feels hemmed-in by nearby institutions. Four of the system's 16 campuses are in the "Triad" area that includes Greensboro and Winston-Salem, and the three institutions in the Raleigh-Chapel Hill-Durham area are only an hour away. Charlotte has no nearby competition for its full range of programs (although several good private, liberal arts colleges are nearby), and it enjoys strong local and business support. It is also in the center of a rapidly growing area that includes a segment of South Carolina where UNC-Charlotte and Winthrop College, a public comprehensive institution, are seeking ways to cooperate in serving the population.

Cross-institutional cooperation takes place mainly at the department and faculty level, between Chapel Hill, NC State, and Duke, as they participate in programs in the state's "Research Triangle," or between Wilmington and Chapel Hill in marine biology, for example. Another example is agreement by the three deans of engineering on requirements for students transferring from community colleges. Cooperation between institutions also occurs when a campus with an established graduate program provides help to another campus starting a similar program. Chapel Hill, for example, supported Charlotte's doctoral programs in education.

Institutional cooperation, facilitated by GA, also takes place through graduate centers on several campuses, where one or more institutions offer graduate programs in another campus's facilities. The needs of a geographical area or population segment are served without the expense of building new facilities or new academic programs. Cooperative ventures often start with requests from community groups for new programs. The system serves as a "broker" between the institution that has the need and facility and those with the experienced faculty and established programs. The vice presidents for planning and academic affairs facilitate the process. The initiative ordinarily lies with the campuses, however.

Cooperation soon may be enhanced, under the general guidance of GA, in the area of telecommunications and networking. A committee, including faculty from several UNC institutions as well as GA staff, presented recommendations to the president in March 1992 for upgrading campus telecommunications infrastructure and coordinating networking and communications for research, instructional, and administrative purposes.[8] The new networks will offer students enrollment through interactive video in selected courses available only on another campus. This will provide greater access and eliminate duplication of courses with only limited appeal. Central staff will install the networks and offer training, especially for administrative computing where data security and uniformity of format are crucial.

Mission and Program Allocation

The University of North Carolina recently completed a long-term review of institutional missions and programs that may prove instructive elsewhere. In 1972, the new University of North Carolina system pretty much accepted what it inherited in the way of institutions and their missions. In 1976, the first long-range plan was adopted, assigning missions (based on the Carnegie Classification) to each institution—a structure that has remained in place with only minor modifications wrought by biennial revisions of the plan.

In 1990, the president and board of governors determined that it was time for a ten-year plan. Each campus was asked to prepare an academic program plan, indicating new programs requested and any desired change in its mission. Chancellors were instructed to consult widely on their campuses and with their boards of trustees. The general question posed by the president was, "Where should each institution be at the end of the 1990s?"

Mission statements were developed on each campus, approved by their respective boards of trustees, and then sent to the president. At this point, President C.D. Spangler asked four outside consultants, each with experience as a university president, to review the proposals.[9] The consultants met with the board of governors, with the president, with the 16 chancellors, and in team visits to every campus, with chancellors, deans, and faculty members. The consultants decided early that a ten-year horizon was too long; their recommendations covered the ensuing five-year period, and they suggested that the exercise be repeated in 1996-97.

The consultant panel reviewed every proposal and made recommendations to the president, who invited them to report personally to the board of governors. The board then instructed the president to consider the consultants' report and the original proposals and to make recommendations to the board's committee on educational planning, policies, and programs. The president and staff of GA's planning division did so, forwarding a set of recommendations that followed the consultant report in most particulars.

The board's planning committee reviewed the documents, considered each recommendation in the university's total context, and made its recommendations to

the board. The board adopted the recommendations and subsequently requested the president to prepare a new long-range plan for 1992-97 on the basis of these approvals.

What were the results of this complicated consultative process? First, there was a minimum of acrimony or bitterness among the constituent institutions. Although all were not completely satisfied with the results (one campus in particular was disappointed in its hopes), there was a perception that all campuses had the same chance to make their case, that all had been treated fairly, and that everyone got something, at least authorization to plan.

Second, the invitation to look at such a long time period—ten years—elicited a great many more requests for new programs than would normally have come in during a regular biennial planning period, and there were also more program approvals. However, the striking feature was not the number of new proposals but the thoughtfulness and restraint the institutions showed. For the most part, they were realistic in terms of demographics, time lines, and budgetary implications. Several of the comprehensive universities said, in effect, that they already were the type of institution they wanted to be; they were not ambitious to become research universities. Two institutions received reclassifications of their mission: UNC-Asheville from Comprehensive University II to Liberal Arts College I, and the actual status of UNC-Greensboro was recognized by changing it from Doctoral Granting University II to DG-I.

Third, although the consultants explicitly used as one of their criteria "the expectation that institutions seeking new programs consider dropping programs...of a lower priority," the process was more successful in preventing duplication of programs than in trimming current duplicative or low-priority programs.[10]

Fourth, the consultants' report explicitly tied the planning process to the structures of governance within the university. For example, they strongly urged interinstitutional cooperation among the campuses, particularly with respect to the very expensive doctoral programs, while maintaining the virtues of institutional diversity. They stressed the need for good management, including pruning weaker or out-of-date programs, and pointed to the expansion of telecommunications as one way campuses could cooperate to reach all regions of the state without duplicating programs.

Regular reviews of existing degree programs within the University of North Carolina are conducted with an eye to identifying strengths and weaknesses, not specifically to cut programs, although some have been eliminated as a result of each review. The process involves reviewing all degree-level programs within a discipline across the university at one time. Out-of-state consultants recommended by the campuses are invited to carry out the review, and representatives of all the institutions offering the program participate. Advantages of this include allowing cross-fertilization of ideas and bringing weaker institutions into the mainstream, effects that many consider the most valuable part of the review process.

Involving outside experts in both regular and special program reviews appears to be one key to the credibility of the process. Looking at programs across the entire range of institutions, not just one campus at a time, also provides an opportunity to consider questions of access and state needs as well as program quality. What is not clear is whether these processes would be sufficient were the need not just to reduce or hold down costly duplication of programs but to cut programs in dire financial circumstances.

What Works?

The campus governing boards, with specific statutory and delegated powers, provide a strong underpinning for local autonomy while also providing a means of holding campus administrations accountable to their communities and to the board of governors. This feature is worth consideration, especially since a substantial number of campuses within systems elsewhere already have informal mechanisms—advisory boards, presidents' groups from the community, foundation boards—that serve some of the local board functions. Bringing these campus-community linkages into the formal structure ensures their accountability.[11]

North Carolina has struggled with the central problem of system administration, how to provide wide access to diverse programs while minimizing duplication, and conserving resources. Although it has not found a perfect solution—no one has—its serious and concerted attempts at mission and program review provide helpful suggestions.

Finally, the University of North Carolina system rests on a base of stable and credible leadership at the campus and system level. The model of dedication and public service exhibited by the board from its inception, as well as that of the two presidents who have served the system in its current form, is not lost upon other participants.

Kansas Board of Regents Institutions

The Kansas Board of Regents is one of nine statewide governing boards for senior institutions (out of 23 such boards in the nation) in which the chief executive does not have line authority over the campus presidents in the system. The executive director (known as the commissioner in some states) serves as staff to the board. Campus heads report to the board, not to the executive director. These more loosely organized systems are sometimes overlooked in discussions about centralization or other issues, partly because they tend to be older systems (six of the nine were in place by 1945) and therefore not part of the widespread debate in the 1960s and 1970s over higher education reorganization. They also are mostly found in more rural states with Populist traditions that encourage settling differences one-on-one rather than appealing to a higher authority.[12]

Communication and Culture

Kansans value education. Attending a college or university is not viewed as a way off the farm as much as a necessary training to enable one to return to his or her community and contribute to its economic and civic life. Although the state's resources are limited, public higher education has been relatively well supported. The Kansas Board of Regents, mandated by the state constitution, governs the six state senior institutions and two branches. Community colleges are governed by the state board of education. Washburn University of Topeka, the other public senior institution, has its own board, but is trying to become part of the Regents system. With some 17,400 budgeted positions, the board of regents is one of Kansas's largest employers. Some 40 percent of all Kansas government workers are employees of Regents institutions, and classified employees fall under the state government's personnel system.

The six Regents universities enroll more than 85,000 students and award all the state's doctoral degrees. Kansas is a public education state: 80 percent of Kansas high school graduates who enroll at a four-year institution attend a Regents university; few attend college out of state. There is a thriving sector of small, church-related private colleges. Individual regents are usually products of one of the system's institutions and often have served their alma mater in some way. Membership on the board is considered a high honor. "The strength of our institutions and our system is due to having good people as regents," said one interviewee.

The board's nine members are appointed by the governor for four-year terms, subject to confirmation by the state senate. Regulations ensure wide geographic representation and political balance. In recent years, the board has maintained a strong nonpartisan stance. One campus administrator said he could not tell which regents were Democrats and which were Republicans from listening to them in board meetings. Interviewees find this freedom from partisan political influences a strength of the system.

Regents are subject to more than routine senate confirmation hearings. Detailed questions are posed about the nominee's views on educational policy and on their understanding of issues facing the system. The system office provides regents with an excellent orientation manual (including a section on "Measurement of Board Performance"), organizes early visits to campuses, and helps prepare new regents for their confirmation hearings.

The regents must overcome the ubiquitous problem of knowing enough about each campus to assess the effects of policy decisions on it, while avoiding micromanaging campus operations. System staff work to inform the regents through a regular diet of such written and oral communications as board meeting packets, student newspapers and alumni magazines from all the campuses, selected campus mailings, press clippings from around the state and nation, a subscription to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and occasional issues papers written by the executive

director. Regents are encouraged to visit the campuses, and the board chair visits every campus at least once a year. The board asks the campus heads to bring their highest level administrators to every board meeting, evaluating campus teams as well as presidents.

The system is lean, with a system staff of only 18, and the culture of the state encourages direct communication among people sharing a common interest or problem. The down-to-earth attitude is, "Why take your concern to the system office when you can call up your counterpart in another institution and settle things directly?"

Kansas is a populist state. It does not want to emulate either the East or West coasts, and some campus interviewees thought the system would be better off if the regents and system staff would stop reading the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and getting too many ideas from outside! They believe that Kansas, while limited in its resources (it ranks 32nd in the nation in population), does not face some of the desperate problems now confronting states that have experienced economic recession. They argue that slow but steady progress, based on stability and proven structures and ways of work, should be the way of the future, too.

Others, and this includes some regents and system staff, say they believe Kansas is not immune from the troubles besetting higher education elsewhere in the nation and that change is of the utmost importance. Some speak of "growth by substitution" to indicate the need to meet the demand for new programs while operating within the same or only slightly expanded resources. And estimates are for a substantial increase in student numbers in Kansas higher education—up 16 percent to 18 percent over the 1995-2000 period. The populist stance in the state and legislature has prevented the system from implementing a policy of "qualified admissions" that the board of regents has favored since 1987; any Kansas high school graduate is still permitted to enter any of the Regents institutions without regard to grades or test scores. Some qualifications have been placed on out-of-state students, however.

The regents, for their part, argue that some mandated floor of preparation would increase students' chances of success in college, use resources more effectively (there is a heavy dropout rate in the first year), and enable the system better to carry out its obligation to supply the state with a high-quality work force. But the tradition, upheld by the legislature, has been that Kansas residents, the taxpayers who support the institutions and their children, should have full opportunity to attend the public university of their choice and make their way or fail by their own efforts. Many are fearful that qualified admissions might work against some students.

Rural-urban demography is more important than political parties in Kansas higher education politics. Two highly urbanized areas—Wichita and Johnson County (suburban Kansas City)—exist in an essentially rural state. When the Regents Center was proposed for Johnson County, some legislators expressed resentment. The governor had to explain that a center was needed where campuses could coopera-

tively provide the programs employers in this large population center were demanding for their employees. Periodic calls for reorganization of the Kansas higher education structure have proposed a "superboard"—that is, removing the 19 community colleges from the state board of education's jurisdiction and placing them in a system controlling all of public higher education. Some two-year and four-year institution administrators think the system should be rationalized in this way, yet many oppose it. Regents now meet occasionally with the board of education to discuss such topics as high school graduation standards or higher education admission standards, and this is helpful.

Centralization/Decentralization

The individual universities strongly defend their autonomy, reacting vigorously to any attempts at undue authority by system staff. The discussion on page 39 of mission and role is an example. System staff are organized by function and have considerable direct contact with their counterparts on the campuses.[13] Although campus chief executives attend all board meetings and report to the board, much of their communication with the board is handled through the executive director. Presidents (called "chancellor" at the University of Kansas) protect their right to take issues directly to the board, even if they do not often exercise that right.

Some interviewees think that being hired and evaluated by the board of regents allows presidents to stand or fall by their own efforts—they can't say "the system made me do it." Good administrators are said to be attracted to Kansas by the considerable campus autonomy. Leadership is stable, with sitting presidents having served an average of eight years (in 1992), compared with the national average of seven years or less in public institutions.

The system office is located across the street from the state capitol in Topeka, a city with no Regents institutions. This is cited as a reason for including Washburn University of Topeka in the system. Proximity provides high visibility, but legislators have not used it as an excuse for meddling in the system.

Legislative appropriations are made to individual campuses, but regents must approve all budget requests before they go to the legislature. In addition, the board monitors institutional spending. End runs by campuses for pet projects are infrequent and strongly discouraged. Legislators, of course, are particularly interested in allocations for campuses in their own districts—the institutions their constituents and their children attend and that provide jobs. One way the system tries to harness natural legislative interest is by forming a coalition of legislators from the communities in which regents reside, keeping that key group informed and interacting.

Each institution has one or more legislative liaisons in Topeka during the 90-day legislative session. Their sometimes schizophrenic task is to speak for the system, while reporting back to their campus presidents. The system's general counsel, who also carries the title of director of governmental relations, recently has taken the lead in organizing campus advocates to increase the credibility of system leadership, avoid

problems of intercampus communication and the different messages they bring to the capital, and use campus networks to support all the institutions. By working together, this group presents an effective, united, highly visible front for the institutions in a state with limited resources and only 2.7 million people.

In the 1988-90 Margin of Excellence program, for example, the regents office led a largely successful effort to increase resources for selected programs at each campus. A primary objective was to increase faculty salaries, and the effort was structured so that either everyone got something or no one did. Campuses had little incentive to do otherwise than support the system initiative.

Private fund-raising is left to the individual campuses, and each has a separate endowment association, organized as a private, not-for-profit corporation with its own board. In most of the institutions, the endowment association takes the place of a campus development office.

Wichita State University has a local board of trustees with limited powers, a holdover from the days when it was a municipal university. That board is responsible for allocating funds from a municipal mill levy (local taxation) earmarked for the university; the levy also is a carryover from when Wichita became part of the Regents system. The regents can veto decisions of the local board about how the money is spent, but they cannot mandate specific expenditures. In recent years, the fund has been used for two purposes: to amortize bonded indebtedness and for program support (faculty travel, research assistance, and the like). While the trustee board has no governing authority, it provides a useful link to the community. Some observers speculate that, should Washburn University become a part of the system, a similar arrangement will be made.

Most operational matters, such as processing payrolls and purchasing, are left to the campuses, under state government guidelines. A system director of facilities reviews plans for physical development, but architects and contractors are selected locally. No central student database exists, although this has been proposed as a service the system office or one campus might provide for all institutions. This would facilitate student mobility throughout the state.

The overall picture is one of substantial decentralization and campus autonomy combined with a great deal of consultation, both between the system office and the campuses and among campus administrators.

Coordination and Control

If the system office has only 18 employees, and much of their time is spent educating and supporting the board and dealing with the legislature, how are system issues handled? Kansas's answer is a council system. It encourages negotiations among the campuses, advice and recommendations to the system staff and board from the campuses as a group, and good consultation on issues. System officers meet with the major councils, the executive director with the Council of Presidents (COP), and the director of academic affairs with the Council of Chief Academic

Officers (COCAO). With the exception of COP (where the campus staff of the president serving as chair that year handles logistics), system officers are responsible for scheduling council meetings, developing agendas in consultation with the council chair, and writing and distributing minutes. System officers also serve as agents of the board in questioning the campus administrators for adequate information and informed recommendations for decision making.

Council of Presidents

The Council of Presidents, formed in 1963, is chief among these systemwide councils. The chair rotates annually among the campuses; chairs of the other councils are the appropriate functional administrator from the same institution as the COP chair. The major function of the COP is "to consider subjects of systemwide significance and make recommendations to the board on general policy affecting all institutions," although any campus president may put an item on the agenda. Much time is spent on legislative relations, the adequacy of budgets, and other systemwide policy issues. Meetings are held just before board meetings.

Council of Chief Academic Officers

The Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) started in 1969. One member described it as "the system's quality-control mechanism." COCAO is responsible for the overall academic plan for the system, and it is here that board policies with respect to establishing new programs are carried out. One might expect some "log rolling" among the group—you support my new program this year, and I'll support yours next year—and some of that does take place, but it is not extensive. The council serves as a forum for discussion and consultation on a wide range of academic questions across campuses, reporting to the Council of Presidents. It was deeply involved in the negotiations for a generally acceptable board statement on mission, role, and aspiration in 1991. COCAO also serves as the governing body for the University of Kansas Press, operated by the University of Kansas.

Other councils

The Council of Business Officers (COBO), the Council of Student Affairs Officers, and the Council of Public Relations Officers all report to the Council of Presidents. A Council of Faculty Senate Presidents is invited by the board chair to address faculty concerns throughout the system at each board meeting. The Student Advisory Committee (SAC), consisting of the student body president from each of the six universities, attends meetings of the board of regents and makes recommendations to the board on student affairs and concerns, as well as on course and curriculum planning and faculty evaluations. The board includes SAC members on systemwide task forces where their contribution is relevant.

Coordination

Consultation is widespread, with the system office taking the lead on some issues, but with coordination taking place principally through direct meetings and

negotiation between campus officers through the councils. Both system and campus administrators quoted Fred Ness: "It takes less time to touch bases than to mend fences."[14] The present arrangement has been in place for three of the councils (COP, COCAO, and COBO) since the 1960s, and its success subsequently caused it to be extended to other functional areas. There are now councils of deans of continuing education, engineering, education, arts and sciences, and others, as well as the administrative councils already mentioned. Almost every interviewee commented on the council system, citing it as a major feature of Kansas higher education and one that works very well.

Cooperation and Competition

One chief executive commented that cooperative relations among the campus heads are made easier by being within a comprehensive rather than a single-mission system. This is because the peer groups and the primary competitors for the different institutions lie outside the state—the University of Kansas looks to its sister institutions in the Association of American Universities; Kansas State is a land-grant institution, and its list of peer institutions is made up of such universities; Wichita State looks to selected urban universities; and the three regional campuses share a group of peer institutions (mostly comprehensive colleges and universities).

Although each university has a primary service region, there is competition for students. For example, Emporia State has no community college in its immediate area, so it tries to draw transfer students from community colleges around the state, and the major state universities openly compete for National Merit Scholars.

Competition for programs, and their budgetary support, is said to have been more intense among the Regents institutions in the past than it is now, partly because the Margin of Excellence drive was organized so that everyone got something or no one did. The effort reinforced the lesson that the institutions would fare better together than they would by competing separately. "Fairness" was mentioned several times as a prized virtue. "Bully tactics won't sell in Kansas," said one interviewee, adding that citizens believe in waiting your turn: "You won't get a new coat every year, but you won't get cold, either."

Lead campus

One form cooperation takes is the "lead campus," one institution operating a service for the whole system. For example, the University of Kansas operates the University of Kansas Press and administers the state scholarship program. Kansas State leads the system in statewide telecommunications, while Wichita State has taken the lead in on-line budgeting. Kansas State also has developed an information system, the "Faculty Profile System," to catalogue faculty members according to their special areas of interest to assist journalists and business people in finding experts in a given field. The system is being expanded to include the other institutions as well.[15]

The three regional institutions also might take on systemwide tasks. They do have carefully differentiated missions so that they are serving the state, if not the other

institutions, in quite different ways. Emporia State is the principal teacher-training institute; Fort Hays is the "electronic campus"; and Pittsburg State's Applied Science and Technology Program serves the whole state, to note selected areas of emphasis.

Mission, Role, and Aspiration

In 1986, the Kansas Board of Regents approved mission statements for each of the constituent institutions, stating that they would be reviewed in five years. In 1991, therefore, a review was initiated by the board and staff. First, a plan on the "development of mission" was presented by a board-appointed task force composed of three institutional members and two central-office staff members. Adopted in June 1991, the report reviewed the external and internal environment for Kansas higher education, suggested six strategic themes to guide system planning, and outlined steps for the upcoming mission review.

The strategic themes included a review of (1) system governance and campus administration; (2) processes for academic program approval and review; (3) faculty compensation, evaluation, and productivity; (4) the quality of the undergraduate experience; (5) use of instructional facilities; and (6) student financial-aid needs. The task force also recommended that institutional mission statements be expanded to include statements of institutional role and aspiration, defining "role" as the programs, constituents, and level of degree offerings that distinguish one institution from another. "Aspiration" dealt with major program goals to the year 2000, areas targeted for excellence, and new program initiatives.

The board subsequently directed system staff to draft a position paper based on these recommended themes. That draft was roundly criticized on the campuses for increasing centralization and signaling an attempted "power grab" by the system staff. One disputed recommendation, for example, was for the board to assume "increased authority over budgetary components. Ultimately, the board will seek authority to allocate the entire budget among the institutions it governs." This practice is widely followed in other systems Kansas universities consider peers, but campuses objected.[16] Another disputed recommendation made eliminating "unjustifiable program duplication" a touchstone of academic planning. Campuses resented what they saw as rigid guidelines for classroom use and other infringments upon their autonomy.

A counterproposal, based on the same themes, was drafted by representatives of the institutions themselves, mainly through COCAO. It omitted any reference to budget consolidation and turned principal responsibility for program review and assessment back to the institutions. In the area of academic program reviews and unjustifiable program duplication, the following was the institutional document's position:

> Program duplication among Regents institutions is permitted only to the extent that *the institutions* judge that it enhances the quality of the individual institutions and promotes the attainment of institutional missions or serves the

needs of a particular geographic region. *Institutions* will consider centrality to mission when allocating resources and making decisions about program continuation. [emphasis added][17]

There were other differences, but these few illustrate the tensions between the system's and institutions' positions.

In response, the director of academic affairs for the Regents received the thankless task of writing a document that would be accepted by both sides. Drafts were negotiated within a group of ten people that included two regents, the system executive director, the director of academic affairs, two presidents, two academic vice presidents, and the chairs of the system's faculty and student senates. After considerable discussion, agreement was reached, and the board approved the final document, which drew heavily on the institutions' proposal. Gone were references to centralizing budgetary authority or establishing a 38-hour-per-week usage goal for classroom space on every campus. At the same time, issues of program duplication were not left solely to the judgment of the institutions, as the presidents and academic vice presidents had proposed. For example, the final wording of the section quoted above read as follows:

> Program duplication among Regents institutions is permitted only to the extent *that the institutions demonstrate to the board* that it enhances the quality of the individual institutions and promotes the attainment of institutional missions or serves the needs of a particular geographic region. Institutions *and the board* will consider centrality to mission when allocating resources and making decisions about program continuation. [emphasis added][18]

The final document also changed the order in which the themes were treated, making undergraduate education and graduate education and research the first two, a symbolic but important change signaling that all parties put educational quality above questions of administration.

What was gained? Was the year of campus-system tension worth the results? The evidence is not all in, but the answer seems to be Yes. In November 1992, the institutions submitted their reports, including new mission statements, role and aspiration statements, and program review data. These included recommendations to discontinue programs, although "unjustifiable duplication" was not cited as driving the decisions. System staff reviewed the statements and recommendations, negotiated some changes with the campuses, and forwarded the reports to a subcommittee of the board, which asked more questions. In December, the first two parts of the reports for all the institutions—new mission and role statements—were approved by the board, with plans to look at statements on aspiration and programmatic recommendations early in 1993. The remaining themes will be taken up later in 1993 as each campus draws up a strategic plan, based on the new mission, role, and aspiration statements.

The process was long, tedious, and filled with tension. But the processes of consultation and the concept of a partnership, rather than a hierarchical relationship,

between the members of the board of regents, their staff, and campus personnel (administrators, faculty, and students) held firm throughout. The process has been outlined in some detail not to recommend that other systems should start with "wish lists" that differ so greatly between the system and the campus but to point to the mechanisms that enabled the process to succeed:

- The tradition of open consultation and negotiation among the campuses and between them and the board and staff.
- The existence of the councils of presidents and chief academic officers that provided time-tested forums for eliciting campus viewpoints.
- Most important, the willingness by most of the participants most of the time to realize that they really had the same goal: to provide high-quality education to Kansas students and meet the needs of the state, even while they differed on the best way to attain those goals.

What Works?

Institutional cooperation was cited as a hallmark of the Kansas system, and the councils are the means through which cooperation among campuses is achieved. The system maintains a unified approach to the state at the same time it fosters institutional differentiation and integrity. Institutions compete more with peers outside the system than with other campuses in the system. The state and the regents help campuses develop and maintain differentiated missions and attain a level of excellence within the external peer groups.

The simplicity of the system—a small central staff, much face-to-face negotiation, direct access from campus heads to boards when necessary—fosters openness. "Simplicity demands honesty," said one interviewee.

Like other systems in the study, Kansas has enjoyed stable leadership. The structure allows presidents to succeed or fail, attracting administrators who welcome responsibility. Regents who take their roles seriously but do not meddle in campus affairs contribute to the success of the system.

Maricopa County Community College District

The Maricopa County Community College District serves Phoenix and its surrounding area, a prosperous and growing community. It is a dynamic institution, headed by a chancellor many label a visionary. This vision is shared throughout the district and is pervasive, whether one is talking with a member of the governing board, a system administrator, or a campus head. Seldom does an institution perform so many different functions for so many people with such internal consistency of mission.

"The mission of the Maricopa Community Colleges is to create accessible, effective, and affordable environments for teaching and learning for the people of our communities in order that they may grow personally and become productive

citizens in a changing and multi-cultural world." So runs the mission statement of the almost 30-year-old district serving an area the size of the state of New Hampshire. Each of the ten colleges and centers develops its own mission statement within this overall framework. The services they provide include general education to prepare students for transfer to four-year colleges, employment preparation, basic skills education, continuing education and community services, and economic-development services for businesses, industry, government agencies, and their employees. Approximately 177,000 students take credit courses in one of the colleges every year, and 48 percent of Arizona State University's upper division students have transferred from Maricopa.

The district is governed by a five-member board, with members elected by districts throughout the county. The board has taxing authority but has now reached its limit. Almost 60 percent of revenues come from property taxes, with the state supplying just 17 percent. A chancellor heads the district administration, with presidents and provosts as chief executives of the colleges and centers.

Centralization/Decentralization

One vice chancellor said: "The system's role is protecting the governing board, legally and fiscally, and providing services where it's better done at a system level." A president put it differently, arguing that the system provides "college autonomy with broad central direction from the chancellor's office."

Programmatically and educationally, Maricopa is highly decentralized. The system is "service oriented," as one president put it. Once budgets are allocated, campus chief executives and their staffs can pretty much "run their own shop," although administrators at both the campus and system level acknowledged "the usual tensions." Hiring and staffing plans are decentralized, and the colleges tend to have different organizational structures.

Financially, the system is both centralized and decentralized. Expenditures are centralized; for example, payroll and the employee-designed cafeteria-benefits plan are handled centrally. On the revenue side, student fees are paid at local colleges, but state aid and property taxes come centrally. Each campus presents a budget proposal to the system, and the budget that goes to the board is a collaborative effort. There is considerable pressure on campus presidents to avoid end runs to the board on behalf of their pet projects. Because of the demographics of the county, inclusion in the system benefits most of the colleges at budget time. If each operated separately, the feeling was that "there would be one winner and nine losers."

Employment is "centrally decentralized." Although the district provides service functions (such as help on equal opportunity laws, affirmative action, advertising, and interviewing practices), each campus hires its own faculty and staff. Neither classified (nonacademic) appointments nor part-time faculty are reviewed by the district, but all new full-time faculty are interviewed by the chancellor or vice chancellor of quality and employee development before their names are forwarded to the board for approval.

The district also centralizes faculty pools. Instead of advertising each faculty opening at every college, the district runs advertisements three or four times a year for ongoing generic faculty pools. For example, the English pool contains about 800 candidates. When an opening arises, names are immediately available to the college. The pools have attracted significant numbers of women (more than 50 percent) and minority (25 percent) applicants.

Providing a working environment that will attract, retain, and increase the performance of excellent staff is a central administration priority. Flextime, other flexible working arrangements, employee-designed benefits plans, ample compensation, and other programs help Maricopa in its intent to apply the same philosophy of human development to employees as they do to students. A "wellness program" administered by the vice chancellor of quality and employee development is an unusual example. The program, according to its mission statement, "creates and sustains healthy teaching and learning environments for employees and students by offering care-effective and cost-effective programs." A major component is to encourage physical fitness. Not all the college presidents were initially enthusiastic about the fitness centers attached to each college; most managers grew up in an age where "caring" was not an organizational priority. Central leadership was essential to put these programs in place throughout the district.[19] Even the skeptical find the fitness centers have productivity benefits and also attract people to the colleges who then enroll as students; the centers serve as marketing devices. The wellness program also provides employees or their families counseling in times of need, and reimbursement accounts allow employees to finance child care and elder care with pretax dollars.

Coordination and Control

Executive councils are a distinctive Maricopa feature. They are districtwide groups with broad representation that serve both consultative and decision-making functions on policy and operational issues. These councils help especially on concerns about information technology, capital projects, and budget development. As a rule, they include the chancellor, the four vice chancellors, one trustee, one college president and, in some cases, the chair of the faculty association.

Most interviewees thought there should be greater representation from the colleges—another president or two—on each of the councils. Although the presence of members of the governing board on operational committees goes against current wisdom about appropriate trustee participation, their participation appears to create few problems, and any that may arise are outweighed by the advantages of first-hand knowledge of college problems and activities. One president did comment that perhaps trustees "get too many bites of the apple," and certainly there is the possibility, with a different cast of participants, that confusion of governance and management might occur.

Meetings of each executive council are chaired by the appropriate vice chancellor. Another distinctive feature of Maricopa is that the chancellor doesn't chair anything. He attends, he observes, he comments, he leaves to attend to other business, but his delegations of power are significant. The Capital Development Executive Council (CDEC) is chaired by the vice chancellor for educational development, which helps integrate physical needs with academic plans.

The Presidents' Council consists of all the college presidents, center provosts, the chancellor, vice chancellors, and the faculty association president. It is chaired by the vice chancellor for educational development, with appropriate areas handled by others. The chancellor participates from time to time but does not chair any portion of the meeting. The formal agenda with standing items includes minutes, budget and finance, personnel and staffing, executive council reports, and reports on organizations in which the system and colleges participate.

A coffee session before the meeting and informal conversations afterward provide campus chief executives with an opportunity to discuss matters of mutual interest. Sometimes this takes the form of horse-trading of staff. The chancellor has a no-layoff policy in the district for faculty and staff beyond a probationary period, so that when positions are eliminated, every attempt is made to find another job for the people involved, on another campus if necessary. Retraining may be provided, as when all typewriter repair personnel in the district were retrained to work on computers.

The system exercises some control, some coordination, and considerable support. The ethos, if not always the reality, is demonstrated by the business cards of district personnel. They are identified not as working at anything called "systemwide administration," but at the "District Support Services Center."

Competition and Cooperation

The colleges in the Maricopa system are both competitive and cooperative. They work on the "earthquake theory," says one president. That is, if one college has a good idea, it will spread to the others. Competition for good ideas is encouraged, although it is somewhat mitigated by assigning each college a primary service area, with the college at the geographic center of a circle with a six-mile radius. These areas were determined by studies that showed most students attend a college within six miles of their homes.

New locations for colleges and centers are established by looking at unserved areas. At the same time, some students do register at more than one college, either simultaneously or sequentially. Geographical service areas stimulate the colleges, too, to look for niches within those areas and to seek partnerships with industry or business. For example, Motorola University, devoted to upgrading the skills of the 21,000 Motorola employees in the Phoenix area, is affiliated with nearby Mesa Community College.

Only Rio Salado Community College has no such designated geographical service area. It has no campus but serves the entire county through a delivery system of 250 programs in storefronts, malls, military bases, and prisons, as well as by providing the distance-learning component for the district and running the National Public Radio station. The college was originally established to bring Maricopa programs to unserved geographical areas in the county, including start-up programs at locations eventually destined to have colleges of their own. It operates with ten full-time and 700 adjunct faculty to serve more than 28,000 students each year.

The "everywhere college" concept produces the possibility of conflict with other, more place-bound institutions in the district, but these occasional turf battles are settled through negotiation between the affected colleges' presidents. This is the general rule for conflict resolution within the Maricopa district. Whether between presidents or between a vice chancellor and a campus chief executive, people are expected to work out their differences directly. The chancellor has made it clear that he has not chosen the role of referree and expects solutions to be found by those involved in a conflict.

Information Technology

One area of particular interest is information technology, where leadership from the central administration, strong participation by college faculty and administrators, and trustee involvement create a unique and highly successful information environment. Maricopa's approach to computer technology cuts across issues of centralization and cooperation and, perhaps most interestingly, raises the question of what are the cultural and symbolic aspects of an electronic system.

Information technology at Maricopa is sophisticated, and policies are devised at the highest levels of the district. The council system, discussed previously, originated as a way of managing computing. ITEC, the Information Technology Executive Council, originally was made up of the system's vice chancellors, the chancellor, a faculty representative, and one college president. Very soon, more members were added: the vice president for technology from nearby Arizona State University, a district governing board member, and a representative from a local high school district with which Maricopa has a cooperative program aimed at keeping minority children in school. In a sense, ITEC is a miniature governing board for its function, making policy decisions through formal votes, a public record, and wide representation.

Centralized functions are hardware purchasing, repair services, and most software development. "Distributed" computing, with heavy reliance on the network, replaces the early attempts in the 1970s to use a mainframe system. "What failed was putting a centralized computer system in a highly decentralized environment. We've made computing match the organization; technology flows with the management structure," said one interviewee. Student databases are dispersed to the campuses, the one activity some observers thought might better be done centrally, but the general belief is that each college should be able to manipulate its own student and class lists.

Some colleges are even considering smaller units for databases, such as divisions or departments. In any case, all are joined by networks so that any college's databases can be accessed from anywhere in the system—an advantage since many students enroll in more than one college simultaneously.

Some districtwide instructional technology projects are managed by different colleges—the "lead campus" idea. And instructional technology crosses the lines of two vice chancellors, requiring high levels of consultation and cooperation at that level as well as among the campuses.

Symbolically, the heavy investment in cutting-edge technology represents Maricopa's intent to be one of the nation's leading community college districts, using modern technology to streamline services, improve instruction, and meet the needs of high-tech industries. Important to receiving widespread acceptance for the technology was leadership from the top. The chancellor was the first person to use an electronic-mail system. He then asked that communications to him come via E-mail, so others were encouraged to join the network. Placing technology policy high in the organizational structure, first through ITEC and then also through a vice chancellor, sends a message about the importance of information and technology.

Are there dangers in letting so many people have access to so much information? There is a great capacity for mischief, but it appears to be minimal in practice. Occasionally, someone will misuse the system—to try to sell their house or for political advocacy—but people cherish the system as a communications device and tend to self-police its use.

One of the interesting features of technology at Maricopa is Ocotillo, which its instigator, Vice Chancellor Alfredo G. de los Santos, Jr., describes more as a "process" than an "organization." Ocotillo, named for a desert cactus that, once implanted, grows in all directions, is an interactive process that brings together faculty and administrators from throughout the Maricopa district to envisage new uses for technology in the support of teaching and learning. Principally faculty-driven, with support staff from the district, Ocotillo has been in place since 1988. A report on the project states, "The Ocotillo process draws people in to share their visions and to work together to accomplish their goals. As this process unfolds, people gather together, bringing with them their own ideas and the experience they have gained at their respective colleges. The interaction then provides the impetus for people to promote change."[20]

Each year a few special projects are chosen by participants within general categories such as administrative or instructional computer conferencing, library users group, nontraditional instructional issues, and support for technologies. Collaborative projects have included "Discipline Dialogues," to form alliances among faculty with similar interests across colleges; library technology; training students to use Internet and BITNET, electronic information networks; computer conferencing; developing HyperCard applications for the classroom; and of special interest in fostering cooperation among campuses within a system, shared classrooms where

interactive video classes are taught at one college and transmitted by microwave to another (and in the future, possibly to students at home with computers).

Commitment to technology that improves teaching and learning and as a catalyst for change is apparent throughout the Maricopa District, led and supported by commitment from the highest system levels.

Program Allocation and Duplication

One president commented that one advantage of the system is that it allows colleges to specialize, but the general impression is that there is relatively little central coordination of programs. Good programs are adopted by other institutions; all campuses offer transfer curricula; colleges and centers are encouraged to develop partnerships with businesses and industries in their geographical service area. The size of the district and the geographical separateness of the colleges, combined with their extreme sensitivity to the needs of their particular area, make for a more entrepreneurial attitude toward programs. Eliminating unnecessary duplication has not, at least so far, been an issue in the fast-growing Maricopa County Community College District.

What Works?

Several factors are crucial. First, resources have been sufficient to allow campus entrepreneurship. Although the district operates well below the national average among community colleges for unit costs, times have been good, and money has been adequate to fund good ideas. There has been some organizational slack. Several people wondered aloud how possible future resource constraints would affect the present sense of openness and dynamism.

Second, there is tremendous sharing of information within the system. The symbolism of having a vice chancellor for information technologies is not lost upon participants. Openness is the hallmark. While several interviewees commented on the dangers inherent in such openness, all agreed that sharing information, and the trust upon which that sharing is based, are among Maricopa's greatest assets.

Third, leadership at the level of the board and chancellor, as well as on the campuses, has been stable and excellent. Board members clearly understand their role as policy makers and use their access and involvement to support operational decisions, not to second-guess them. The chancellor and several presidents have served far longer than the national averages. Talent is often home-grown; three of the current presidents were once deans at Glendale College, whose president had mixed emotions. He's pleased to see the people he picked acknowledged as the best but chagrined that he keeps losing his deans! Some interviewees commented on the danger of becoming too ingrown but were willing to accept it, at least with present personnel, as the price for continuity and stability.

Maricopa's connections to its community are strong, and the colleges are attuned to the needs of students of all ages as well as the business community, and

they keep close contact with the nearby state university. And it is to the colleges, not the system, that people turn for services. The district has "sought our refuge not in 'Maricopa' but in the individual colleges." The system has been the beneficiary of "advantageous anonymity."

The chancellor, as well as others, speculated about what kind of leadership will be needed for the future, a future in which everyone sees increased financial constraints at the same time that growth in the Phoenix area calls for more services from the district and the college. The challenge for Maricopa will be to retain the sense of "family," of trust, of openness, along with the dynamism and vision that have characterized the past decade, even as they move into conditions that are more characteristic of the rest of American higher education in the 1990s.

The University of California

The University of California, with nine campuses, is one of three public systems in the state established under the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education; the others are the California State University and the community college system. The University of California is the only public segment authorized to award doctoral and certain professional degrees; it is the principal vehicle for research; and the top 12.5 percent of graduating high school seniors in the state are eligible for admission. The California Postsecondary Education Commission is the coordinating body for all California higher education, but it does not exercise direct authority over the university, although it reviews new academic programs.

History and Culture

The university, founded in 1868, celebrated its 125th anniversary in 1993. All nine campuses are classified as research or doctorate-granting universities, and in this sense the university is a single-mission system rather than a comprehensive system such as Kansas or North Carolina. At the same time, it offers both undergraduate and graduate instruction and enrolls about 166,000 students.

A marked characteristic of the university's student body today is its ethnic diversity, a reflection of the state population, which is rapidly becoming a population of minorities. Slightly more than one-half of the students identify themselves as white (54.4 percent in 1991). There is *no* majority racial or ethnic group in Berkeley's undergraduate population, for example.

The University of California (UC) has considerable autonomy with respect to the state; its board of regents was established as a separate entity by the state constitution. Eighteen regents are appointed by the governor with the approval of the state senate for 12-year renewable terms, and there are seven regents *ex officio*. Four are publicly elected officials—the governor, lieutenant governor, the speaker of the state assembly, and the superintendent of public instruction. Three are connected with the university—the president and vice president of the university's alumni association, and the president of the university. There is one student regent,

and two nonvoting faculty members sit with the board. A constitutional amendment requires the governor's appointments to be "broadly reflective of the economic, cultural, and social diversity of the state, including ethnic minorities and women," although no seats are set aside for special groups as in North Carolina. There is also a panel to screen prospective regents, although no governor has made full use of it.

The first campus, at Berkeley, was for many years the University of California. Except for Santa Barbara, which was forced upon the university by the legislature in 1943, UC has controlled its own growth in terms of new campuses. During the 1960s, three new campuses (Irvine, San Diego, and Santa Cruz) were added to the six then existing (Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Francisco, and Santa Barbara). The system also was reorganized at that time to make all but San Francisco (which concentrates on health sciences) into general campuses with a full array of undergraduate programs, graduate programs, and research. Extensive efforts in the 1980s, in a relatively favorable financial climate, brought rapid development to the newer and smaller campuses so that the claim of equality among the campuses with respect to quality of faculty and programs more nearly became reality.

Like many of its counterpart institutions around the nation—including the flagship campuses of the universities of North Carolina and Kansas in the group considered here—the University of California has played an important role in the history of its state, educating legislators, professionals, and citizens throughout its 125-year history. The organic nature of the University of California, growing as it did from a single campus at Berkeley and largely controlling its own destiny, has helped establish a unitary culture for the institution at the same time that far-flung campuses have taken on quite distinctive activities and structures.

"One University"

"We are building one great university in California. Let no small mind direct you along the paths of suspicion, distrust, or jealousy," said President Robert Gordon Sproul in 1932.[21] The "One University" ideal is still a guiding ethos. Its elements include the following:

- A common mission. All campuses are doctoral-granting universities.
- The centrality of the presidency. The president of the university is the only line officer to the board, and operational responsibility for the university, with its nine campuses and many related enterprises, has been delegated by the regents to the president, who remains the incarnation of the "One University" ideal.
- Faculty are members of the universitywide academic senate, and faculty recruitment standards and pay schedules are presumed to be identical across campuses.
- The campuses share common admission standards.
- The land-grant status of the original campus at Berkeley is now shared within the university as a whole. The University of California is the only system in the nation that is a member of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Both unity and differentiation are basic elements in the university's culture. As new campuses have been added to the university, each has been assigned or taken on special structures and roles to provide distinctiveness within the single university ideal.

Communication

The University of California depends heavily on a system of rules and processes. So much activity takes place on each campus that no one can currently track it all; the Berkeley campus, for example, spends some $2 million per day. Accountability depends upon mutual trust that faculty, administrators, and system officers will adhere to guidelines and clear delegations of authority and responsibility, subject to post-audit procedures.

A system of this size and complexity, however, also is threatened by rigidity through bureaucratization. The central administration now numbers approximately 1,700 employees, and recent growth is attributed largely to requirements for personnel to monitor compliance with federal and state regulations. The office of the president peforms a myriad of functions, only one of which is university administration[22]. Also, as a result of its constitutional status, the university conducts operations in a number of areas that elsewhere would be left to state agencies. Still, there is an awareness at all levels, from faculty to president and regents, that the sheer size of the enterprise and the consequent necessity to rely heavily on bureaucratic methods makes it all the more important to establish cross-cutting relationships and to encourage initiative.

The administrative councils (described on page 54), continual faculty interaction through academic senate activities across the campuses, and direct communication between office of the president personnel and those in similar functional areas on campuses help provide the glue that holds the massive system together.

Centralization/Decentralization

The University of California is a centralized system with respect to policy, but a highly decentralized system in operations, where campus heads (chancellors) exercise wide discretion. There is a presumptive preference for decentralization within the University of California, a belief that those closest to an issue can make the best decisions. At the same time, there is selective centralization, with the following factors considered as decisions are made about what to retain at the system level:

- Formation and acquisition of the state's share of the university budget.
- Need for universitywide policies, plans, or consultation, including centralization of information and a capacity for analysis.
- Efficient and effective use of resources, as in centralization of the university's debt service and retirement and benefits systems.
- Public accountability to the state for fiscal responsibility and actions of the entire institution.

■ Administration of universitywide programs, such as the University of California Press and Cooperative Extension, and strong coordination with respect to health issues that cut across the five campuses that operate health-related programs.

■ Functions that cannot be decentralized for legal or contractual reasons, such as collective bargaining, operation of the U.S. Department of Energy laboratories, and compliance with state and federal regulations, such as affirmative action or occupational health and safety.

One interviewee described the whole system as a "Devil's pact: The office of the president doesn't micromanage the campuses, and the chancellors don't go around the president to the legislature."

Financing the university

Almost every function of the office of the president is in support of a single budget to take to the state, one interviewee noted, "including dealing with the fact that UC is both loved and under attack in Sacramento. People who love us want us to do more, with no new resources, so we have to explain why we can't do it. For the people who hate us, we have to explain and justify everything we do. And both produce work loads."

The university's unified budgetary request to the state is derived from negotiations between the campuses and the office of the president and is basically formula-driven. It is included, with modifications, in the governor's budget to the legislature. State appropriations are made in a lump sum to the university and then are allocated by the central administration to the campuses, again in lump sums, for further allocation by the chancellor. Allocations to campuses generally follow the lines of the original agreed-upon budget requests, except when total appropriations fall short of the full amount requested.

About 3.5 percent of a campus's budget normally reverts from schools and departments to the chancellor's office because of faculty retirements and resignations.[23] Several interviewees said it was important for campuses and the system to retain or recapture some funds in order to create opportunities for change.

Because it is one of the nation's preeminent research universities, receiving large numbers of grants and contracts from the federal government, private businesses, and foundations, the University of California is, along with some other major state universities, well along the road to privatization: Only 24 percent of the university's current budget of $6.8 billion now comes from the state coffers, although that portion supports basic instructional functions.

Capital projects

The university maintains a central priority list for buildings. The office of the president is more involved in capital projects than in most campus operations, and many on campuses would like to have greater control over planning and construction. Campuses do nominate architects, and when the president submits them, their choices usually are approved by the regents.

Reasons given for central involvement include the following:

- Campuses lack the capacity to carry out environmental-impact studies, and meeting state and federal requirements is a system responsibility.
- Planning processes vary among campuses and have cost implications. System involvement ensures similar per-unit costs for similar facilities.
- Trustees tend to be more familiar with grounds and buildings than with academic matters; to avoid embarrassment with the board, the system office steps in to ensure sound planning.

Campus officials maintain that system requirements are more stringent than the state actually requires, resulting in higher costs than necessary, and that there should be more flexibility, within overall cost guidelines, as construction progresses. Further complications arise when a substantial portion of a building's cost is donated. At what point is the donation sufficient to move that building to the head of the priority list, taking resources from other campuses to complete necessary funding?

No ready solutions arise; capital projects are just one area where tensions always will exist between system central offices and the campuses. In some states, legislators or other state officials also become personally involved in siting or designing a building, a fate fortunately spared the University of California principally because of its constitutional status.

Academic senate

More than 70 years ago, the regents delegated to the faculty of the University of California broad powers in determining admissions, academic degrees, programs, and personnel. In addition, two nonvoting faculty representatives sit with the regents and under a recent reorganization are included at the highest levels of budgetary consultation in the office of the president.

Faculty participation in the governance and management of the university and its campuses goes beyond that found in most higher education institutions. There is an administrative structure running from president to campus chancellors to schools and colleges to departments. At the same time, there is a structure of academic governance that runs from statewide academic senate to divisional (campus) senates to faculties of schools and colleges, a parallel but not identical structure and set of tasks.

A major difference between the University of California and other universities is not that faculty are widely consulted; any experienced administrator knows enough to sound out faculty on issues that affect them. But in most institutions, administrators can choose whom to consult and may, on occasion, speak only with those faculty they expect will agree with a proposed policy or course of action. In the University of California, faculty choose their own leaders and spokespersons, and administrators and regents are obliged, under the regulations governing the university, to consult with them through institutionalized processes and on a wide range of topics.

The senate deals on a regular basis with the following:

- Major policy issues dealing with the university as a whole.
- Approval of programs.
- Evaluation of statewide academic activities.
- Academic personnel issues.
- Faculty welfare, including compensation.

The academic senate comprises faculty from all the campuses, and faculty on each campus comprise a divisional senate. Operations are carried out through committees at both the statewide and campus levels, and a university assembly includes divisional and statewide committee chairs and other faculty representatives. The academic council acts as the senate's executive committee.

Faculty governance reflects the decentralized nature of operations within the university at the same time that it illustrates the impact of the "One University" ethos. And it is an article of faith within the university that placing decisions about what to teach and who should teach it in the hands of faculty has been a major factor in the success of the university as an educational and research institution.

Coordination and Control

Two aspects of UC's general approach to system-campus relations illustrate the principles of shared governance between faculty and administrators that mark the University of California: the role of the system in initiating academic improvement and mechanisms for coordination.

Systemwide academic initiatives

In a system where all campuses have similar missions, opportunities arise for central administration to focus attention on issues that are important to all the campuses that might go unaddressed without central leadership. These initiatives redirect the time and attention of the whole organization. Assessment has been such an issue in some systems. At the University of California, the spotlight currently is on undergraduate education.

In the late 1980s, two universitywide committees recommended improvements in undergraduate education to which faculty, through the academic senate, committed themselves.[24] In February 1992, President David P. Gardner called for "a renewed and vigorous collaboration between the divisional academic senates and [campus] administrations" to bring about specific improvements in undergraduate education recommended by these groups. There were four objectives:

- To increase the number of freshman and sophomore seminars.
- To reduce class size wherever possible.
- To increase the range and number of opportunities undergraduates have for supervised research.
- To increase the number of class sections and courses so that students can make timely progress toward degrees.[25]

The president requested specific three-year plans and timetables that would describe how each campus planned to meet these goals. His request reinforced another major thrust, a conference on undergraduate education that occurred just a week after his letter was sent to the chancellors.

The All-University Faculty Conference on Undergraduate Education was organized by a committee of faculty members representing all eight general campuses and was initiated and staffed by the office of the president. Its theme was "the role of the department in shaping and delivering undergraduate education."[26] The organizers believed that the earlier reports had set forth the major issues; now the problem was to determine what structures and processes were necessary at the departmental level, where teaching takes place, to improve undergraduate education along the recommended lines.

The invitational conference was held in a retreat setting, lasted for three days, and was attended by 200 people, including the university president, the chancellors of all nine campuses, department chairs, academic senate leaders, faculty with special interests in undergraduate education, academic administrators from system and campuses, and 11 members of the board of regents—a broad spectrum of those in a position to bring about change in the university. A closing session brought together participants from each campus to plan campus-based initiatives.

In the ensuing months, the campuses formulated their plans to meet the goals set by the president. The summary report of the plans affirms the University of California approach of diverse campuses within a single university: "Each campus tailored its plan to its particular needs and included activities built on its recent initiatives as well as new ones. The diversity of the plans reflects the uniqueness of each University of California campus. Yet all plans share a common theme of commitment and action."[27]

Councils and advisory groups

Like the other institutions examined here, the University of California makes use of councils as a means of coordination between the office of the president and the campuses. The president meets regularly with the Council of Chancellors (COC); similarly, vice chancellors for academic and administrative affairs, respectively, meet together with the appropriate vice president. The Council of Chancellors and the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) are especially important links in the processes of budgeting and policy formation and offer an opportunity to share concerns and ideas across campuses.

Other administrators, such as student affairs or graduate deans, also meet together as administrative councils. In addition, the University of California makes extensive use of universitywide advisory groups that usually operate as standing committees. These committees are made up of administrators who serve in a similar capacity on the several campuses, and are chaired by a representative of the office of the president in that functional area. These groups range across administrative specialties, from academic computing to labor relations to libraries.

These cross-cutting mechanisms for consultation and coordination, both among the campuses and with the central administration, provide a matrix organization that complements the reporting relationship from each chancellor to the president of the university. The size of the organization precludes having all communication go through the campus head. Formalizing the advisory and consultative relationships clearly delineates their roles and assigned jurisdictions, prevents the councils and groups from becoming forums for griping or end runs, ensures that accountability is through the campus chancellor, and still allows cooperation between campus and system in functional areas.

Cooperation/Competition

The words "parallel play"—a developmental stage in which children play by themselves but within a group—come to mind when describing cooperation, or lack thereof, among the University of California campuses. They do many similar things—undergraduate teaching, graduate programs in arts and sciences, research—but there is also differentiation of structure and programs, as in the college system at San Diego and Santa Cruz and in the concentration of health sciences on the San Francisco campus, agriculture at Davis, or Pacific Rim studies at San Diego.

Cooperation

Multicampus research units (MRUs) exist on every campus (except the San Francisco medical campus) as well as in universitywide administration to marry the resources of faculty and researchers throughout the University of California to solve specific problems. The National Laboratories at Livermore and Los Alamos and the Agricultural Experiment Station are examples of universitywide organized research efforts. However, several interviewees observed that more opportunities for cooperation exist across campuses than present activities now represent.

Lower division requirements

One area that illustrates the importance of the academic senate to systemwide cooperation is the successful effort to define what will be required of students transferring to a UC campus in their junior year as an upper-division student. Traditionally, under the regents' delegation of power, each campus set its own curricular requirements. Transfer agreements were worked out covering equivalency of courses between a university campus and individual community colleges—a massive job that frequently resulted in students having to retake courses to meet a campus's unique requirements. Furthermore, students transferring between campuses of the university ran into the same problem: Breadth and general-education requirements differed across campuses, and each had some that could not be fulfilled elsewhere. Each campus's faculty believed it had developed a special approach to lower division education, including unique course or sequence requirements, and that the campus's academic integrity would be harmed by accepting another institution's definition of general education.

In 1987, the academic senate's universitywide assembly approved a policy of intercampus reciprocity, under which students completing breadth and general-education requirements at one of the university's campuses would be regarded as having completed the requirements of any campus to which they subsequently transferred. Then, in 1988, the assembly approved a transfer core curriculum for students transferring from a community college or a California State University campus. Those who had completed the core courses at their former institution would be considered as having completed the breadth and general-education requirements on the receiving UC campus.

This example illustrates both the ways in which campus distinctiveness and differentiation are maintained, as well as how the system provides a forum where policies widely recognized as unfair to students could be debated and changed.

Lead campus

In addition to MRUs, each campus has a number of specialized programs, schools, or organized research units (ORUs) that take a lead role in academic offerings or public service. The Institutes of Industrial Relations at Berkeley and Los Angeles, for example, head up the university's statewide activities in labor relations, industrial management, and occupational-health studies.

The second version of the lead campus, where a campus performs a service for the system itself, is not common, although examples do exist, as in the Education Abroad Program administered by the Santa Barbara campus. It may be easier for these activities to occur in systems where institutional missions are more highly differentiated and where lead activities are closely tied to those special missions.

Competition

"Each campus is highly competitive with the others, but together we're very cooperative," said one administrator, going on to suggest cynically: "We have a common enemy, the central administration!" There is competition for top faculty members, both from other campuses within the system and from institutions around the world; there is also competition for new programs, guided by the office of the president to produce a balance of programs across the system rather than duplication.

For example, the original desire of San Diego for a business school, of which the system has several, was turned into a very effective faculty proposal for a school of international relations with an emphasis on the Pacific Rim. Berkeley's response to that program was to reorganize its Institute of International Studies by adding a new Center for German-European Studies, largely externally financed.

The close and frequent consultation among campus leaders, both through administrative councils and participation in the academic senate, ensures that all campuses are well aware of one another's activities. Competition aims toward campus differentiation and increasing excellence in personnel and programs.

Program Allocation/Duplication

Program allocation in the University of California works mainly on market principles, with the faculty as the driving force, rather than on top-down system decisions. Reviews of existing programs and proposals for new programs within the system take into account a variety of factors, of which duplication is a relatively minor one, although this may change under current and anticipated budgetary shortfalls. Other considerations include academic quality, need, student demand, resource requirements, and the job market for graduates. At the graduate level, the issue is whether the campus can afford the supporting infrastructure—the libraries, researchers, laboratories—that a new program requires. Every general campus is expected to have a good array of undergraduate and graduate programs and some professional schools. Health-affairs programs exist on five campuses, and there are pressures to limit those because of their very high costs.

Program review

Establishment of new undergraduate programs is handled mainly at the campus level, with the office of the president becoming deeply involved only if there are special resource issues. Reviews of proposed graduate programs, new organized research units, and new campuses are system issues. The reviews can and do lead to recommendations that a program be strengthened, phased out, redirected, or combined with other programs.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission reviews and comments on new graduate programs but does not have power of approval or veto. However, if objections arise, programs usually are modified so that these programs will mesh with overall state plans. Final approval for new programs, depending upon their structure and scope, rests with the campus, the office of the president, or the regents.

A hallmark of program review is the joint participation of faculty and administration at all levels. The inclusion on committees reviewing existing programs of faculty from other campus departments, from other campuses within the system, and sometimes from outside the university helps ensure that programs reflect the most up-to-date intellectual developments in the field.

The Academic Planning and Program Review Board, a joint venture of the office of the president and the systemwide academic senate, constitutes the major mechanism for reviewing proposals for new programs. One advantage of this mixed group of people representing campuses, the statewide senate, and the office of the president is that it minimizes log-rolling. The ethos of excellence among these highly visible research universities means that one campus will not support another's mediocre program hoping to receive the same treatment.

Resource constraints

Money for a new program must come from the campus budget, or the campus must raise private funds to support it. Program approval generally does not bring new money unless the office of the president has a specific interest in furthering the

activity. The result is that campuses that have reached their maximum enrollment levels can only start new programs by squeezing or eliminating current operations.

Recent severe state budget shortfalls have resulted in cutbacks in the university's budget and add to the resource problem. How will decisions be made about what will be cut? Two scenarios that affect programmatic allocations have been proposed: Cut campus budgets on an overall basis in proportion to their size or make cuts in line with campuses' long-range development plans.

The first proposal hits the smaller and newer campuses very hard; they depend upon state funds for a substantial part of their budgets, and they are just filling out a full array of graduate and research programs. It would mean scaling back on long-range plans and instead concentrating on smaller programs in a limited number of fields. The second proposal preserves the smaller campuses' development plans, but would hamper the larger campuses, mainly Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Similar problems arise on each of the campuses, with the role of administration sometimes seen as "protecting the weak-but-essential against the strong." The dilemma is whether to eliminate the new to preserve the excellence (or necessity) of the old or to cut back established programs to encourage growth of new academic enterprises. The practical answer will probably lie somewhere in between, and such problems of program allocation are now facing not only the University of California but also university campuses and systems throughout the nation.

It is likely, given UC traditions, that faculty will play a new and significant role in these decisions. But there will be tensions—among faculty from different campuses, among schools and departments on a single campus, between faculty and administrators, and between the university and the state. In the past, new programs could be approved on the basis of their need and the quality of the proposed faculty and facilities. Now, and in the foreseeable future, a balancing act will be essential: What will we give up if we want something new? These decisions come hard, and no higher education institution has yet devised a way to make them in a timely fashion (academic decision-making operates on a different time line than administrative), to achieve the necessary resource cutbacks, to preserve excellence in programs slated for continuation, and to be fair in the eyes of all participants.

What Works?

Speaking to the state with one voice is widely cited as a major advantage of the system. Constitutional autonomy, a board of regents that sees advocacy of the university as a major role, programmatic and budgetary processes centered in the office of the president, a sophisticated bureaucracy that can negotiate on somewhat equal terms with experts in the state bureaucracy, and an ethos of "One University" all contribute to the ability of the university to deal as a single entity with its various constituencies.

Closely related is the system's ability to regulate relations among nine highly competitive campuses to improve each one instead of allowing any campus to subvert its neighbors. Free competition is encouraged, but in such a meritocracy the only common ground for agreement is academic quality.

Trust is essential—between the state and the university, between the office of the president and the campuses, and among the campuses. Preaudit of operations is impossible in an enterprise this large, and each participant must trust the others to follow the rules and to dedicate themselves to the welfare of the university as a whole.

Of special importance in the UC system is the role of faculty in academic governance and programming. Both formal delegation of authority and broad informal consultation reflect the atmosphere of trust between the regents, the administration, and the faculty. There was general agreement that faculty participation is a major factor in maintaining overall quality standards.

Lump-sum budgeting to campuses, based on agreed-upon formulas, was commended by interviewees from both the system and the campuses. Not only does this method of financing operations provide needed campus flexibility but it helps reduce politicking among the campuses and at the state level.

Board of regents' committees meet consecutively, not concurrently, permitting all regents and officers of the university to attend all committee meetings. The practice increases the regents' depth of understanding of the whole institution and provides common information on any given issue. Other regents' practices considered helpful include the following:

- A firm calendar of meetings to enable regents and administrators to plan their schedules.
- Board meetings that always include the president, except for some sessions on presidential compensation or evaluation where the president is excused.
- All business coming to the board must come through the president, and chancellors report to the board only through the president.

The consensus was that centralized operations such as debt servicing increase debt capacity and lower costs. Maintaining lines of authority and formal reporting arrangements, while placing no restrictions on communication, was viewed as a useful way of work.

Endnotes:

1. Quoted in Rudolph, Frederick, *The American College and University*. New York: Vintage Books, 1962, p. 36. Rudolph cites Kemp Plummer Battle's *History of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh, 1907–12*, Vol. I, pp. 1-2.

2. For the details of discussions, plans, and actions taken, see King, Arnold K. *The Multicampus University of North Carolina Comes of Age, 1956–1986*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina, 1987.

3. *The Code*, Board of Governors, The University of North Carolina, August, 1988, Sec. 203 (1).

4. Massachusetts, New York (SUNY), and Utah also have statewide boards for four-year institutions with local boards holding limited powers. Maryland has provisions for local boards at the discretion of the campus president. The powers of the North Carolina boards of trustees are more extensive than any of these.

5. *The Code*, Board of Governors, The University of North Carolina, August, 1988, Sec. 403 A.

6. *The Code*, Sec. 602 (1). Tenure is held in a particular institution, not in the University of North Carolina.

7. Derived from Appendix, "Delegations of Duty and Authority to Boards of Trustees," *The Code*, pp.35-38.

8. The committee's "basic recommendation" was to "develop an integrated, flexible, universitywide networking and communications infrastructure that by 1997 connects classrooms, laboratories, and offices on each campus to the resources of the National Research and Education Network. Coordinate the planning for this infrastructure to ensure that the number of connections and their various transmission speeds, both of which will vary from institution to institution, meet the comprehensive needs of each institution, as well as the advanced networking needs of various research programs." *Report on Networking and Telecommunications*, Committee on Networking and Telecommunications, The University of North Carolina, March 31, 1992, p. iii.

9. The consultants were R. W. Fleming, president emeritus of the University of Michigan; Norman C. Francis, president of Xavier University of Louisiana; Billy J. Franklin, former president of Lamar University in Texas; and Bryce Jordan, president emeritus of The Pennsylvania State University.

10. *Report to President C.D. Spangler, Jr. on the Missions of the University of North Carolina Campuses*, November 8, 1991, p. iii.

11. See the similar recommendations in Kerr and Gade, *The Guardians*, pp. 123-124.

12. The states and the dates of the founding of their governing board are: Arizona (1945); Idaho (1890); Iowa (1909); Kansas (1925); Mississippi (1910); Montana (1973); North Dakota (1939); Rhode Island (1981); and South Dakota (reorganized in 1973). From McGuinness, Aims C., Jr. and Christine Paulson, *State*

Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook 1991. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1991.

13. Staff functions include academic affairs, facilities, planning and budget, policy and procedures, and student financial aid. The Student Assistance Programs, which provide financial aid to students at all types of institutions in Kansas, public and private, are under the jurisdiction of the board of regents.

14. Ness, Frederick W. *An Uncertain Glory.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971, p. 14.

15. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* December 9, 1992, p. A17.

16. Kansas Board of Regents. *From Aspiration to Achievement: Mission Development in the Kansas Regents System, 1992–2000.* August 29, 1991, p. 7.

17. Council of Presidents/Council of Chief Academic Officers, Kansas Board of Regents. *Partnership for Quality: Mission and Strategy for the Kansas Board of Regents Institutions.* November 1, 1991, p. 9.

18. Kansas Board of Regents. *A Strategy for Mission Development in the Kansas Regents System.* January 16, 1992, p. 12.

19. See Waechter, William F. "Beyond Wellness: Solutions for the 1990s," *Leadership Abstracts,* 4, 11. Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College, Laguna Hills, Calif.

20. Maricopa County Community College District. *Ocotillo: Improving Learning Through Technology: 1990–91 Year-End Report,* 1991.

21. Stadtman, Verne A. *The University of California: 1868–1968.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970, p. 268. Robert Gordon Sproul in an address to UCLA students, September 27, 1932.

22. Others include managing laboratories for the U.S. Department of Energy, administering agricultural field stations and cooperative extension, running a natural reserve system, conducting relations with schools, and relating to state and federal agencies, for example.

23. Faculty lines coming open due to nonpromotion do not revert; otherwise, there would be no incentive in the department to maintain quality. Interview with Neil Smelser.

24. The reports were from the Task Force on Lower Division Education (Neil Smelser, chair, 1986) and the President's Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Education (1989).

25. Letter to chancellors of all general campuses from President David P. Gardner, February 7, 1992.

26. All-University Faculty Conference on Undergraduate Education, 1992, p. 1.

27. Office of the President, University of California. *Campus Plans to Protect and Improve Undergraduate Education: Overview and Campus Highlights.* September, 1992, p. 1.

APPENDIX A

Systems Data, 1991–92

	NC	KS	MCCCD	CA
Number of campuses	16	6*	10	9**
Students enrolled per year	150,000	85,000	177,000	166,000
FTE	130,000	60,000	48,800	161,000
Degrees awarded	28,000	14,500	***	38,300
Operating budget	$1.7-b.	$972-m.	$173-m.	$6.8-b.
Local boards exist	Yes	No	No	No
Campus CEOs report to:				
System CEO	X		X	X
Board		X		

* plus 2 branches

** plus an affiliated law school

*** MCCCD awarded 2,845 associate degrees in 1991–92. In addition, 3,469 students transferred to public four-year universities in Arizona, and several hundred to private institutions, most without receiving a two-year degree.

APPENDIX B
Bibliographic Note

As noted in the text, system governance is no longer as popular an area for research and publication as it was in the 1960s and early 1970s, when many states were consolidating governance of public institutions. The following list includes a few of the works illustrative of that period's concerns. Interested readers are encouraged to look up other works by these authors; they are the scholars and administrators (and often both) who laid the groundwork.

In addition, more recent pieces are included, none comprehensive in its scope. Investigators and system personnel agree that the time is ripe for a major study of the evolution of systems over the last two decades that lays out promising directions for the future of systems development.

Berdahl, Robert O. *Evaluating Statewide Boards,* New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Berdahl, Robert O. With the assistance of Jane Graham and Don R. Piper. *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982.

Glenny, Lyman A., and Frank A. Schmidtlein. *The Role of the State in the Governance of Higher Education.* Stanford, Calif.: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, 1980.

Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems. A Report and Recommendations by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Harcleroad, Fred F. *Institutional Efficiency in State Systems of Public Higher Education.* Tucson, Ariz.: Higher Education Program, University of Arizona, 1975.

Ingram, Richard T., ed. *Governing Public Colleges and Universities: A Handbook for Trustees, Chief Executives, and Other Campus Leaders.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Johnstone, D. Bruce. *Central Administrations of Public Multi-Campus College and University Systems.* Studies in Public Higher Education, No. 1. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1992.

Kerr, Clark, and Marian L. Gade. *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1989.

King, Arnold K. *The Multicampus University of North Carolina Comes of Age, 1956–1986.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Lee, Eugene C. "Multicampus Universities," in Burton R. Clark and Guy Neave, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education,* vol. 2, Oxford, England: Pergamon Press, 1992, pp. 1174-1179.

Lee, Eugene C., and Frank M. Bowen. *Managing Multicampus Systems: Effective Administration in an Unsteady State.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Lee, Eugene C., and Frank M. Bowen. *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

McGrath, C. Peter. "Governing the Multicampus University." Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1990.

McGuinness, Aims C., Jr. "Perspectives on the Current Status of and Emerging Policy Issues for Public Multicampus Higher Education Systems." AGB Occasional Paper No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1991.

McGuinness, Aims C., Jr., and Christine Paulson. *State Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook, 1991.* Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1990.

Millett, John D. *Conflict in Higher Education: State Government Coordination Versus Institutional Independence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Mingle, James R. *Effective Statewide Coordination: What Is It?* Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers, 1985.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and T.R. McConnell. *Sharing Authority Effectively.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Multi-Campus Systems of Public Higher Education in the United States: 1992. Washington, D.C.: National Association of System Heads, 1992.

Newman, Frank. *Choosing Quality: Reducing Conflict Between the State and the University.* Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1987.

Pettit, Lawrence K. *Old Problems and New Responsibilities for University System Heads.* National Association of System Heads, Monograph Series No. 1, 1989.

Schick, Edgar B., Richard J. Novak, James A. Norton, and Houston G. Elam. *Shared Visions of Public Higher Education Governance: Structures and Leadership Styles That Work.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1992.

APPENDIX C

Those Who Helped in This Study

(Titles are those at the time of the interview or those most relevant to the study. State abbreviations indicate that the interview dealt principally with one of the four systems under review. An asterisk indicates member of advisory panel.)

Armstrong, Warren B. President, Wichita State University (KS)

Ayres, Ted D. General Counsel and Legislative Representative, Kansas Board of Regents (KS)

Bleed, Ronald D. Vice Chancellor for Information Technologies, Maricopa Community Colleges (MCC)

Boyette, Alan. Former Assistant Secretary, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

*Broad, Molly Corbett. Senior Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance, The California State University

*Brophy, Roy T. Regent of the University of California (CA)

Brown, David G. Former Chancellor, University of North Carolina at Asheville (NC)

Brown, Tom. Special Assistant to the Chancellor, North Carolina School of the Arts (NC)

Brownlee, W. Elliot. Professor of History, University of California at Santa Barbara, and Chair, Assembly of the Academic Senate, University of California (CA)

Budig, Gene A. Chancellor, University of Kansas (KS)

Callan, Patrick M. Director, Higher Education Policy Center (CA)

Campbell, Donald C. Member, District Governing Board, Maricopa Community Colleges (MCC)

Carroll, Roy. Vice President for Planning, University of North Carolina, General Administration (NC)

Carson, Philip G. Former Chair, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

Christiansen, Larry K. President, Mesa Community College (MCC)

Dawson-Sauser, Nancy. Director of Public Relations, North Carolina School of the Arts (NC)

de los Santos, Alfredo G., Jr. Vice Chancellor for Educational Development, Maricopa Community Colleges (MCC)

Dickson, Joseph L. Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, North Carolina School of the Arts (NC)

Durham, Ralph. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Appalachian State University (NC)

Ehringhaus, Susan H. Assistant to the Chancellor and Senior University Counsel, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (NC)

Elms, Roslyn R. Assistant Vice Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley (CA)

Elsner, Paul A. Chancellor, Maricopa County Community College District (MCC)

Enarson, Harold. Former President, Ohio State University

Evans, Charles D. Member, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

Flack, Charles Z., Jr. Secretary, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

Fort, Edward B. Chancellor, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University (NC)

*Fretwell, E.K. Jr. Chancellor Emeritus, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Friday, William. President Emeritus, University of North Carolina (NC)

Gardner, David Pierpont. Former President, University of California (CA)

Garwood, John A. Member, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

Glennen, Robert E., Jr. President, Emporia State University (KS)

Hammond-Paludan, Martine. Director of Academic Affairs, Kansas Board of Regents (KS)

Harcleroad, Fred F. Former President, California State, University-Hayward

Hardin, Paul. Chancellor, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (NC)

Harrison, Myrna. President, Phoenix College (MCC)

Heilbron, John. Vice Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley (CA)

Hershey, H. Garland. Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and Vice Provost, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (NC)

Hitchcock, Barbara. Chair, District Governing Board, Maricopa Community Colleges (MCC)

Hullar, Theodore L. Chancellor, University of California at Davis (CA)

*Johnstone, D. Bruce. Chancellor, State University of New York

Jones, Wayne. Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (NC)

Joyner, L. Felix. Vice President for Finance, University of North Carolina, General Administration (NC)

*Kauffman, Joseph. Former Executive Vice President, University of Wisconsin

Khachigian, Meredith. Chair, Board of Regents, University of California (CA)

Koplik, Stanley Z. Executive Director, Kansas Board of Regents (KS)

Langworthy, Audrey H. Kansas State Senator (KS)

Lee, Eugene C. Professor Emeritus of Political Science, University of California at Berkeley (CA)

Little, William F. Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of North Carolina, General Administration (NC)

Martin, David G. Jr. Secretary of the University of North Carolina (NC)

McCain, Betty R. Member, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

McCoy, Reginald F. Member, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

*McGuinness, Aims C., Jr. Director of Policy Studies, Education Commission of the States

Memory, Jasper D. Vice President for Research, University of North Carolina, General Administration (NC)

Merritt, Karen. Director, Academic Planning and Program Review, University of California Office of the President (CA)

Monteith, Larry K. Chancellor, North Carolina State University at Raleigh (NC)

*Ostar, Allan. Former President, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Peltason, Jack W. President, University of California (CA)

Pister, Karl S. Chancellor, University of California at Santa Cruz (CA)

Poole, Samuel H. Chair, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

Porter, W. Travis. Vice Chair, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (NC)

Ratzlaff, Robert K. Vice President, Academic Affairs, Pittsburg State University (KS)

Rosenthal, Linda. Member, District Governing Board, Maricopa Community Colleges (MCC)

Simms, Nathan, Jr. Vice President for Student Services and Special Programs, University of North Carolina, General Administration (NC)

Slawson, Donald C. Regent, Kansas Board of Regents (KS)

Smelser, Neil. Professor of Sociology, University of California at Berkeley; former Chair, Assembly of the Academic Senate, University of California (CA)

Smith, Virginia. President Emeritus, Vassar College.

Smotony, Bonnie. Secretary of the Regents, University of California (CA)

Sneden, John. Dean, School of Design and Production, North Carolina School of the Arts (NC)

Spangler, C. D., Jr. President, University of North Carolina (NC)

Strickland, Robert L. Chair, Board of Trustees, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (NC)

Taylor, Priscilla P. Member, Board of Governors, University of North Carolina

Thompson, Cleon F., Jr. Chancellor, Winston-Salem State University (NC)

Thor, Linda M. President, Rio Salado Community College (MCC)

Tien, Chang-Lin. Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley (CA)

Trow, Martin. Professor, Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California at Berkeley; former Chair, Assembly of the Academic Senate, University of California (CA)

Vaughan, Robert C., Jr. Vice Chair, Board of Trustees, Winston-Salem State University (NC)

Waechter, William F. Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Maricopa Community Colleges (MCC)

Waltrip, John R. President, Glendale Community College (MCC)

Whittemore, Dan S. Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, Maricopa Community College (MCC)

Worthington, Joni. Public Affairs Division, University of North Carolina, General Administration (NC)

AGB
Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
77